# DOCUMENT RESUME

| | |
|---|---|
| ED 085 036 | HE 004 936 |

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Mayhew, Lewis B. |
| TITLE | Long Range Planning for Higher Education. Studies in the Future of Higher Education. |
| INSTITUTION | Academy for Educational Development, Inc., New York, N.Y. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Institutes of Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md. |
| REPORT NO | R-3 |
| PUB DATE | May 69 |
| NOTE | 232p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *College Planning; Coordination; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Essays; *Higher Education; *Master Plans; Regional Planning; Research Projects; *Statewide Planning |

ABSTRACT

This report examines current trends in long range planning for colleges and universities and projects the broad outlines of American higher education of 1980. Chapters cover evaluation of coordination and long range planning; the structure of state-wide planning and coordination; master plans for higher education; voluntary coordination and long range planning; institutional long range planning; assessment of planning and coordination; and the future of American higher education. The appendix includes statistical data and information related to state-wide coordination, planning, and individual state status. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

LA
226
.A2
No.3

ED 065036

STUDIES IN THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
REPORT NO. 3

HE

# LONG RANGE PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

THE ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
UNDER CONTRACT PH-43-66-1166 AS AMENDED BY
CONTRACT PH 43-67-1461

With Cosponsorship by
The U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and
Bureau of Health Manpower, Public Health Service

HE 004 736

May, 1969

ED 085036

# LONG RANGE PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

by

**LEWIS B. MAYHEW**

**Professor of Education**
**Stanford University**

**Prepared for the National Institutes of Health**
**Under contract PH-43-66-1166 as amended**
**by contract PH 43-67-1461**

**The Academy for Educational Development, Inc.**

**May, 1969**

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

## Officers and Directors

SAMUEL M. BROWNELL, Chairman
Professor of Urban Educational Administration, Yale University Graduate School
Formerly United States Commissioner of Education and Superintendent of Schools, Detroit

ALVIN C. EURICH, President
Chairman, Education Research and Development Division, FAS International; Senior Consultant for Professional Affairs, Academy of Religion and Mental Health; Chairman, U. S. National Commission for UNESCO

SIDNEY G. TICKTON, Executive Vice President and Treasurer
Director of various studies being conducted by the Academy for Educational Development

JOSEPH S. ISEMAN, Secretary
Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison

ROBERT O. ANDERSON
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Atlantic Richfield Company

FAIRFAX M. CONE
Chairman, Board of Trustees, University of Chicago

GILBERT GRANET
President, FAS International

ROBERT V. HANSBERGER
President, Boise Cascade Corporation

THEODORE W. KHEEL
Partner, Battle, Fowler, Stokes & Kheel

THEODORE LEVITT
Professor of Business Administration, Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration

FRED LUDEKENS
Chairman of the Board, FAS International

LOUIS LUNDBORG
Chairman of the Board, Bank of America; Vice Chairman, Urban Coalition

HERBERT R. MAYES
Director and Consultant, McCall Corporation; Director, Saturday Review
Formerly President, McCall Corporation

JAMES A. MC CAIN
President, Kansas State University

JOHN F. MERRIAM
Chairman of the Executive Committee, Northern Natural Gas Company; Chairman, Business Education Committee, Committee for Economic Development

NEWTON N. MINOW
Senior Partner, Leibman, Williams, Bennett, Baird and Minow
Formerly Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

JAMES O'BRIEN
Vice President and Director, Standard Oil Company of California

---

The Academy for Educational Development is a nonprofit tax-exempt corporation serving schools, colleges, universities, government agencies, foundations, and other public and private organizations concerned with education or desiring to develop educational plans for the future.

New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

(212) 758-5454

Washington, D.C.
1424 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

(202) 265-5576

Denver
820 Sixteenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202

(303) 244-9258

# FOREWORD

This is the third in a series of reports on the future of higher education to 1980. The reports were prepared by the Academy for Educational Development, and based on studies conducted by the Academy, under contract with the National Institutes of Health, with cosponsorship by the United States Office of Education, the National Science Foundation and the Bureau of Health Manpower. The studies were under the general direction of Sidney G. Tickton, Vice President of the Academy.

This report, written by Dr. Lewis B. Mayhew, Professor of Education at Stanford University, examines current trends in long range planning for colleges and universities and projects the broad outlines of American higher education to 1980. Dr. Mayhew was assisted in his research by a group of colleagues whom he lists in the Author's Preface. Editing was by Sherwood D. Kohn.

The Academy is grateful for the cooperation and assistance accorded Dr. Mayhew by planning and coordinating officials in all 50 states, and by various administrators and educators throughout the country, who promptly and generously responded to the detailed queries that supplied major background for this report.

The Academy also wishes to acknowledge with thanks the advice, counsel and assistance provided by the cosponsoring agencies. In particular we are grateful to Dr. Herbert Rosenberg of the National Institutes of Health who acted as project monitor for this study, Dr. John Chase of the Office of Education, Dr. Charles Falk of the National Science Foundation and Dr. Alan Kaplan of the Bureau of Health Manpower.

Alvin C. Eurich
President
ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, Inc.

# AUTHOR'S PREFACE

This study of long range planning for higher education is based upon several kinds of information. State studies of higher education and state master plans provided the basic information. This was augmented by questionnaires sent to the head of each state planning or coordinating agency and by visits to several agency offices. Ideally, all 50 states should have been visited, but such an undertaking would have proven too costly. Consequently, Colorado, Illinois, Ohio and New York were selected as indicating a range of coordinative structure types as well as a variety of problems.

Much of the discussion of state-wide coordination and planning is based on examples because so much variation of detail exists that broad generalization is impossible. However, some patterns or central tendencies do emerge. These are presented in tabular or summary form.

Although the study has been supported by three Federal agencies and conducted under the general auspices of the Academy for Educational Development, Inc., the report is the work of one individual and the observations and judgments are his. The author has been aided by Mr. Robert Chapman, Dr. Robert Funk and Dr. Peggy Heim who did much of the reading of state plans and studies. For their help he is grateful but he absolves them from responsibility for error in fact or opinion. That responsibility is the author's own. As is true of other work done the past few years, the author is indebted to his secretary, Mrs. Evelyn Tahl, who works on a variety of tasks, keeps them all straight and accomplishes them excellently.

Stanford University
June, 1968

Lewis B. Mayhew

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword

Author's Preface

| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I | Evaluation of Coordination and Long Range Planning . . . . . . . . . . . | 1 |
| II | The Structure of State-wide Planning and Coordination . . . . . . . . . . | 30 |
| III | Master Plans for Higher Education . . | 75 |
| IV | Voluntary Coordination and Long Range Planning . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 105 |
| V | Institutional Long Range Planning . . | 126 |
| VI | Assessment of Planning and Coordination | 146 |
| VII | The Future of American Higher Education | 172 |
| | Appendix | 188 |

## CHAPTER I

## The Background of Coordination and Long Range Planning

One of higher education's most rapidly expanding phenomena is the development of statewide coordination systems. Almost concurrently, we are creating statewide blueprints or master plans designed to guide the rational expansion of higher education.

Historically, institutions of higher education have been relatively independent, autonomous agencies conducted by single boards of trustees which constituted the legal institutional identity. While some state or teachers' colleges might be administered by a state board of education, the prevailing style was that of a single board conducting a single institution without much regard for others. Public institutions would appeal directly to state government for funds. Private institutions, competing with other colleges and universities, would seek support from their own constituencies or from the public at large.

Today, most states employ a supra-institutional board, a legislated coordinating council or commission, or a voluntary agency for coordination among institutions. Only ten states have no master plans, higher education studies with the attributes of a master plan, or definite activities designed to result either in a master plan or some form of coordinating agency.

Some educators are still chary of coordinating boards, but the movement towards planning seems inexorable.

Surveys of higher education are designed to produce data that will aid in making more rational decisions about higher education and the needs of people. Coordinating agencies are intended to insure proper deployment of resources so that an expanding educational mission may be accomplished. And master plans are intended to chart the direction in which institutions should move in order to accomplish state educational purposes. Control agencies are responsible for the conduct or operation of institutions, singly or in groups. During the last several decades, as the pattern of American higher education unfolded, these elements have intermingled. They can be separated only with considerable difficulty.

Surveys of higher education, which have only recently become popular and widespread, were first made in the 19th Century. Henry Barnard studied school conditions in Rhode Island in 1844-46. Later, the first U. S. Commission of Education studied the higher education institutions in the District of Columbia.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching sponsored a number of surveys. The most significant was the Flexner report on Medical education, published in 1910. In 1912 a commission appointed by the governor of Virginia studied higher education in that state. And several religious denominations conducted surveys of their colleges in the 1920's. The Congregational church released its Report of the Educational Survey Committee in 1921. The Lutheran and Presbyterian churches published surveys of higher education in 1929. The Methodist

Episcopal Church commissioned Floyd W. Reeves and his associates to study its colleges, and they produced The Liberal Arts College, a prototype published by the University of Chicago Press in 1932.[1]

Likewise, the concept of agencies for coordination and planning is not entirely new. In 1784, the University of the State of New York was created with the intention of embracing all New York institutions. When the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching decided to support a pension program for college professors, it insisted that participating institutions bring uniformity into their accounting systems. Thus it laid a foundation for the concept of supra-institutional coordination and some control. Similarly, the creation of regional voluntary accrediting associations seems basic to the evolution of some form of coordination and cooperative effort.

But it is in the 20th Century that coordination and some planning appeared practicable and acceptable for both public and private institutions. The Claremont Colleges in California--Scripps, Pomona, and Claremont--in order to develop a strong graduate program which no individual institution could afford, decided to pool their libraries and faculty. In Pennsylvania the Quaker Colleges--Haverford, Swarthmore and Bryn Mawr--made a similar arrangement. Within the public sector, Florida and Oregon early sensed the need for some statewide coordination. For more than 35 years, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education has coordinated the planning and administration of the state's public four-year institutions. And in 1948, the creation of the Southern Regional Education board reflected acceptance of regional cooperation on educational problems.

---

[1] This summary is based on Paul L. Dressel and Associates, Evaluation in Higher Education (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961).

The expansion of master plans which envision the assignment of specific missions or functions to different sorts of institutions is also relatively recent. But the concept dates from at least the turn of the century. Both David Starr Jordan of Stanford and William R. Harper theorized that a lower division institution should educate the large mass of college students, thus leaving the university free to concentrate on the few who were qualified to accept graduate and professional education. Even earlier, the Morrill Act of 1862 made desirable some functional differentiation of institutions within a state and forced legislators to give some thought to future role and scope of higher education. For example, in 1864 the New Jersey Legislature designated Rutgers as the state's land grant institution, thus insuring an evolution different for it than for the College of New Jersey at Princeton. Indeed, the Morrill Act clearly envisioned separate colleges for the learned classes and the agricultural and industrial classes in a way not foreign to contemporary thinking about stratification of higher education.

But it is really only in the post-World War II period that state surveys, state master plans and state coordinating agencies have emerged as significant elements of American higher education. California's was one of the earliest efforts, and probably the most obvious. In 1945 the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education established a liaison committee to coordinate public higher education in California. It recommended, and the Legislature authorized, a special committee which published its Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education. This report recommended, among other matters, that funds be provided annually for studies deemed necessary for the development of higher education in California. As an extension of this provision the Legislature in 1953 authorized and financed a Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education.

The liaison committee was to control the study. A joint staff would supervise the efforts of a chief consultant and various other professional and technical assistants. If the joint staff could not agree with the chief consultant's recommendations they were still to be forwarded to the liaison committee for its consideration. The study was to focus especially on enrollment projected to 1965, the role and scope of both public and private higher education institutions, governance and coordination of higher education, expenditure, and the state's financial ability to support higher education. At the time of the study there were eight University of California campuses, 10 state colleges, 61 junior colleges and a number of private institutions. Since private institutions accounted for approximately 28% of the total enrollment, the involvement of that sector in the study seemed essential.

The California restudy, like almost all subsequent surveys and reports, assumed an enormous increase in college enrollments during the sixties. Accelerated birth rate, better health, greater longevity and more demands for qualified people by an increasingly complex economy are all cited. Both the individual and society stood to profit from a higher educational level.

The restudy made a great number of recommendations, many of which need not be recounted here. But the principal items suggest a pattern that characterizes subsequent studies in other states and illustrates, by comparing recommendations with adopted master plans, how rapidly higher education is changing:

* No new state colleges or branches of the University of California should be established before 1965.

* The University of California should move to reduce lower division enrollments in favor of upper division and graduate enrollments.

* New junior colleges should be created, with state assistance, in populous areas not having adequate educational resources.

* The principal of differentiation of function is affirmed with each segment responsible for clearly defined missions.

> Junior colleges should concentrate on technical vocational, general, transfer and adult education but should not offer courses above the fourteenth grade level. Junior colleges should investigate more selective policies with respect to admission and retention of students in transfer curricula.

> State colleges should eliminate their junior college function and are authorized to offer master's level work in certain occupational fields.
>
> The University of California should have exclusive power to confer the doctor's degree. It should further investigate ways of improving selectivity and prediction of academic success.

* Governance of higher education should differ according to type of institution.

> The Board of Regents should continue as the control agent for the University of California but should free itself of much administration and grant greater authority to the president. It should operate the University as a system, not as a group of autonomous campuses.
>
> A new nine-member lay board should be created for the state colleges which would be coordinated with the board of education. This lay board should appoint a chief administrative officer to conduct the state colleges as a unit.
>
> Junior colleges should each operate under local boards but there should be created a Bureau of Junior College Education within the State Department of Education to exercise coordination and leadership.
>
> The liaison committee should be expanded to include representation from all sectors of public higher education.[1]

As a direct outgrowth of the restudy, the liaison committee prepared a Master Plan for Higher Education. Its 60 recommendations derived from a fundamental purpose: the governing, coordination and determination of the future role of California's junior colleges, state colleges, and university so as to avoid unnecessary duplication.

The problem was not new in California. As early as 1899, the California Educational Commission was created to examine the state's educational program. One of its recommendations called for a uniform board to govern normal schools. This recommendation was subsequently enacted into a law which placed the normal schools under the State Board of Education.[1]

---

[1] A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education, Sacramento, California State Department of Education, 1955.

Generally, the liaison committee's recommendations followed those of the restudy. But there were a few marked differences as well as considerable elaboration. Higher education was to consist of junior colleges, governed by locally elected boards; state colleges, governed by an appointed Board of Trustees, and the University of California, governed by the Board of Regents. An advisory body called the Coordinating Council for Higher Education would have the power to require public institutions to submit planning data. Each segment of public higher education should operate with separate admissions policies. The University would accept only the upper 12 1/2% of high school graduating classes, the state colleges the upper 25%,and junior colleges all high school graduates. Both the University of California and the state colleges should seek to reduce lower division enrollments, in effect forcing lower division students into junior colleges. The state scholarship program should be maintained and expanded and apply to junior colleges as well as four-year institutions. No new four-year institution campuses should be created until adequate junior college facilities had been provided. Those campuses approved in 1957 should be limited to upper division and

---

[1] A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975, XI.

graduate work. Minimum, optimum and maximum sizes for all three types of institutions were specified, and the 1975 sites indicated for new junior colleges and state colleges. A major effort should be made to increase qualified college faculty and faculty salaries. State support for junior colleges should be increased to 45% by 1975. All segments of public higher education should be tuition-free.

Many of the master plan's recommendations were enacted into legislation and the system is functioning generally as it was intended. In several important areas, however, practice differs from suggestion. The dispersion of lower division students from the university and state colleges to the junior colleges has not taken place. There is doubt that it will. The amount of state support for junior colleges has dropped, rather than increased. A separate board for junior colleges was legislated when the State Board of Education proved inadequate to handle junior college affairs. But the coordinating council is staffed, conducting studies and making recommendations. It is feared that this complex structure is too inflexible, and that the systems approach, especially to the two four-year segments, does not allow individual institutions to develop properly.

While California's tradition and process led to a tripartite system of higher education, Florida's resulted in a dual system. Florida public higher education consisted of the University of Florida, Florida State University (former woman's college) and

Florida A&M (the Negro land grant college), all located in the northern part of the state and all governed by an appointed Board of Control. In 1956, that board appointed a Council for the Study of Higher education, consisting of five out-of-state specialists. The study plan called for an examination of all institutions, public and private, and for accumulation of demographic, economic and social information.

The study suggested that between 1956 and 1970 college enrollments would triple: from 44,500 to 132,000.

It was assumed that if the economy of Florida diversified and expanded as predicted, professional training would have to be expanded and ways found to produce more technical and semi-professional workers. Existing institutions could be allowed to grow to four or five times their present size, or more new institutions could be created. The Council resolved this issue by recommending a system of junior colleges and the creation of new four-year institutions where the state was experiencing major population growth. It was assumed that each of these new four-year institutions would enroll 10,000 students by 1970 and would constitute intermediate degree-granting colleges between junior colleges and universities. But the demand for professional manpower developed so rapidly that this concept had to be scrapped and the new institutions upgraded to comprehensive universities. The original study suggested that at least three new institutions should be created: the first in the industrialized Tampa Bay region, the second somewhere along Florida's lower east coast and, possibly by 1970, a third in the Pensacola area of the Florida panhandle.

Since the Council for the Study of Higher Education did not clearly delineate role and scope for public institutions, the Board of Control organized a statewide role and scope study while the first new institution was getting underway. The study was conducted by a small central staff. Committees made up of professional people from the several campuses assumed the bulk of discussion and actual data collection. The governing principle for this study, as in California, was the effective deployment of state resources by identifying program duplications and gaps. Each institution was asked to submit its own role and scope plan so that the Board of Control could reconcile differences and conflicts. Finally, a summary of all reports was to be prepared as a state master plan. But the master plan was never completed. Political forces within the state, and a lack of initiative among institutional presidents militated against it.

Some action was taken, however, The legislature appropriated enough funds to appoint a president and a small cadre of administrative people as planners and builders of the University of South Florida. This group early developed a concept that went well beyond what the study council had envisioned. Decisions were made not just for the immediate future, but for a time when the institution would become a full university. The second institution was not so fortunate. The legislature appropriated only a small planning grant. Thus the institution's planners would not be responsible for its management. The state apparently learned from this experience. Cadres were provided for the third and even a fourth new institution.

The original recommendations suggested a blanket of junior colleges covering the state. These would be responsible to the State Board of Education, which is in reality the state cabinet. Florida's cabinet officers are elected and eligible for reelection. The governor may not succeed himself. Thus the cabinet wields great political power. Perhaps as a balance-weight in favor of the four-year institutions, the board of control was changed to a board of regents and a chancellor designated to conduct the university system. The chancellor and a special junior colleges officer in the State Department of Education were assigned to coordinate the junior colleges and the university system.

While the Florida plan did not try to force a reduction of undergraduate enrollments in existing institutions, it did recognize the potential of junior colleges by designating two of the new universities as upper division and graduate institutions. It was assumed that students would take their lower division work in junior colleges and their upper division work at the university. It is still too early to determine the success of this scheme.

Faced with similar pressures, California and Florida each produced centralized systems of higher education, while Michigan set up quite a different system--or lack of it. In 1955, the Michigan Legislature created a Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. This group appointed a Citizens Advisory Committee and named a Director of the Survey.

It should be kept clearly in mind that the Michigan survey was a legislative study. The California inquiries were stimulated by the Board of Regents and the Board of Education and the first Florida study was organized by the Board of Control. But the Michigan committee was made up of legislators and the final report addressed to the legislature. This may explain some of the differences between Michigan's solution and those of the other two states.

The Michigan study quickly assumed two major premises. The first was that increases in population, educational aspirations and trained manpower needs would cause rapid college enrollment expansion. The second was that Michigan should at least bring its educational effort and productivity into line with its wealth, size and population ranking among the states. At the time the study was made, Michigan had only 2.92 per cent of the nation's institutions, but 4.6 per cent of its population. The state concluded that it might well expect to maintain a more extensive and expensive higher education effort than it had in the past.

The gist of the final report is contained in 60 recommendations, some of which affected broad educational policy.[1] The report urged marked faculty salary improvements and recommended creation of a uniform system of financial accounting and reporting so that the legislature might better determine needs of institutions. Other changes urged were:

* Improvement and expansion of the community college program, with weak colleges brought to accreditation level and state financial contribution increased to half the minimum foundation program.

* Removal of the state colleges from Board of Education control and endowment of each with its own independent board. The same principle would apply to all newly created colleges or universities. Eventually a constitutional convention would assign each the same constitutional existence possessed by the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. In order to keep such independence under control, the legislature was urged to create a board for coordination of the state-supported program of higher education. The board of each four-year institution and a recommended board for all community colleges would report to the coordinating body.

* Discouragement, as a matter of public policy, of institution branches. No new ones were to be created and those in existence should be converted into independent institutions as quickly as possible.

---

[1] John Dale Russell, Higher Education in Michigan, Lansing, Sept. 1958.

* Creation of a legislative commission to study and report on the need for new colleges or universities.

* And of course, the omnipresent items of public policy: "It is recommended that the policy of the State be to provide sufficient financial support to its institutions of higher education so that they are able to furnish education of good quality at the lowest possible cost to the student for tuition fees."[1]

It is tempting to speculate on the reasons for such different schemes drafted by men of similar background in response to similar pressures. T. R. McConnell directed the California study, A. J. Brumbaugh led the Florida undertaking and John Dale Russell was the director for the Michigan survey. All are men of vast experience in higher education, and all have headed institutions of higher education. The difference may lie in the conditions existing at the time the studies were made. California had one major university that commanded the loyalty of the state. In Michigan, on the other hand, Michigan State University had emerged from World War II as a potential powerful rival of the University of Michigan. Its agricultural ties seemed to give it political peerage as strong as the University of Michigan's. The rivalry might not allow either institution to aid the other. Furthermore, a coordinated system could jeopardize institutional autonomy.

As for Florida, it has always maintained a strong central state government. Final decisions are made by the cabinet. Perhaps no coordinating agency was needed beyond the state cabinet. It might maintain better control over two agencies, instead of three. And since state contribution was larger, these two agencies centralized control.

---

[1] Ibid.,p. 177.

Regionalism may also explain the difference in approach to planning. Several states that have rejected master planning lie in the north central region. Planning approaches in Indiana, Iowa and Michigan may reflect a Midwestern fear of centralized agencies, although such speculation is tenuous at least.

As states begin systematizing higher education, the general pattern seems to involve one or more studies, followed by some degree of implementation--usually the creation of a coordinating agency--or the commission of another study. The degree and speed of implementation varies enormously among state studies.

Myron Frank Pollack suggested several factors which might affect implementation rates: Southeastern and Western states seem more likely to implement surveys than those in other parts of the country. Population pressures in the West, and fear of a declining population and economy in the Southeast, serve to spur adoption of recommendations. If surveys were conducted by local educators and prestigeous outside consultants, the chances of implementation seemed greater than if either group worked alone. States experiencing rapid population increases and expecting increases in higher education enrollments were naturally more likely to implement programs than static states. Similarly, rapidly industrializing and urbanizing states seemed more ready to act than those in which industrialization was slower. Per capita wealth, on the other hand, seemed unrelated.

While Pollack's generalizations are intriguing, they are only speculations. Perhaps there is no rational explanation for the presence or absence of a master plan, coordinating agency or even a serious study of higher education in any given state. Or it may be that some form of long range planning and supra-institutional coordination and control is the inevitable outcome of higher education's expansion. A review of recent Canadian experience is instructive, because it exhibits events similar to those taking place in the United States.

In Canada all trends and prospects are profoundly influenced by rising enrollments. In 1957 the National Conference of Canadian Universities suggested that universities might expect a doubling of enrollment to 128,900 students in ten years. In fact, enrollments reached that level in seven years. Three years later they passed the 178,200 mark. Latest projections suggest that this figure will double again in the next seven years.

When the National Conference of Canadian Universities was formed in 1911 the members were highly autonomous institutions associating only in informal ways. The Conference, like the American Council on Education, mediated with the Federal government and the universities for such things as aiding the war effort and accommodating returning veterans. After World War II the Conference performed important service by showing that the universities were really national institutions that needed national support. But the enrollment expansion of the late 1950's and 1960's indicated the necessity for deeper involvement on the part of provincial governments.

The result is government agencies which could be called embryos of a provincial system of higher education. The necessity for them arises as soon as two or more universities in a province wish provincial funds. As university grants grow larger, competition for them becomes unwieldy. Some more equitable way of distributing funds is needed. Besides, when university grants become a major element of provincial budgets the Government inevitably interests itself in how the money is spent. British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia already have these agencies. Royal commissions in Manitoba, Alberta, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are all studying higher education, and will recommend provincial support and control of higher education.

Thus the organization of universities is being provincialized. It is difficult to predict how far this will go, but it seems clear that the likelihood of substantial coordinating action is directly proportional to the number of provincially-maintained universities. Faced with the ambitions of several universities, a provincial government must try to limit duplication of highly specialized facilities and courses. Ideally, institutions should concentrate on their strengths and limit their other ambitions. When they fail, the provincial government must step in.

But provincial interest does not seem sufficient. A need is emerging for Canada-wide planning in the development of higher education. The national need for improved health facilities and for strengthened bilingualism is too great to leave these matters to the provinces. Cost increases are so rapid (operating expenditure is doubling every five years) that the traditional sources of income--tuition and provincial grants with some Federal aid--have become inadequate. As a matter of sound public policy, student financial aid should be increased. The Federal government seems the best source. Thus the Federal government is drawn squarely into the main stream of university finance. Before action is taken, however, agreements must be reached between the Federal and provincial governments. There would be little point in Federal support of higher education if provincial support diminished.

Other fundamental issues also force greater Federal and provincial involvement. While Canada has maintained the quality of its faculties it must now compete even more vigorously with the United States for its share. Faculty salaries and fringe benefits have begun to increase, and the end is not yet in sight. Then, too, faculties have begun to demand a share in university governance. This affects the whole matter of coordination and control. And research has become more of a problem: faculties want to do more and more, while teaching less and less. No single institution can correct these difficulties. Some form of supra-institutional coordination, and even monitoring, seems inevitable.[1]

But having said this, the problem of implementation remains unsolved. A summary of issues facing U. S. and Canadian education suggests that both nations face similar problems and that neither has really found ways of solving them:

Although provinces differ, the most populous provinces, and ultimately all, must create coordinating agencies.

The success of coordination seems to rest on whether or not the agency is headed by an executive who can bring the truly relevant matters before his council.

Research studies are essential if coordination is to be effective. A research team responsible to the executive seems the most efficient arrangement. However, this is expensive.

While coordinating councils may seem to infringe on institutional independence, the almost inevitable alternative is political control.

If presidents of individual institutions attempt to override the head of the coordinating agency several principles or responses should obtain: Provincial government should refuse to make private agreements with individual institutions on matters which have been collectively studied. Council members should be willing to take public stands against individual presidents--even powerful ones--who seek preferential treatment. Coordinating agency executives should be prestigeous enough to publicly confront an individual president seeking preferential treatment.

---

[1] This discussion is based on J. E. Hodgett's Higher Education in a Changing Canada, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1966.

Many potentially divisive matters can be resolved by studies and discussions conducted among inter-institutional groups without coming to the attention of the coordinating council itself.

Each province should complete a master plan, and several provinces might even join together to create a regional master plan.

A master plan should establish broad guide lines acceptable to all institutions and should clearly answer the question, "Shall there be some differentiation of function among institutions of higher education in the provinces?" Furthermore, answers are needed to such questions as:

Should only a few institutions be authorized to offer doctoral work or should all be allowed to evolve to that level? Which should offer the principal means of meeting the educational needs of a province, branches or new institutions? Should the classical university be the model for new or emerging institutions, or can other models be contrived?[1]

State master planning is a recent and relatively primitive phenomenon. It is clearly in the ascendency, apparently because U. S. higher education and its costs have grown so rapidly. Legislatures are desperate for some means of understanding the complexity of the enterprise, and some technique for balancing appropriations and resources. A few states have rejected the concept, and at least one theorist, M. M. Chambers, has questioned the validity of plans resulting in state systems. But the consensus is that planning and state systems are useful. And they probably are. Rational thought is likely to suggest more implications and unanswered questions than intuitive action.

---

[1] Based on University Government in Canada, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1966, p. 76.

It is disturbing, however, to find that most completed state master plan recommendations seem to derive more from accepted public policy or opinion than from the facts and conditions of a single state or region. It seems almost possible to draft a profile of any state in the Union from census statistics just by determining the size of an age group, the centers of population and the ranking of the state with respect to a number of factors. A plan can be produced by discussing these and applying accepted principles. The elements of these principles may be briefly summarized:

* The social policy begun with the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, expanded through the G.I. Bill of Rights at the end of World War II, and made explicit by President Truman's Commission and the 1964 statement of the Educational Policies Commission, is generally accepted. It states that universal education should extend upward to at least the fourteenth grade.

* The idea that we need more technologically sophisticated people to conduct a complex urban and technological society is

accepted as a postulate. Institutions of higher education are assumed to be the best vehicles for developing the necessary competencies.

* The junior or community college is an effective and relatively efficient way of providing higher education for students who cannot afford to live away from home, want only two years of college, or who need remedial work before attending a four-year institution. The largest segment in each master plan is devoted, in one way or another, to developing some system of two-year institutions.

* In spite of the American character's strong egalitarian vein, it is generally assumed that there is social stratification based upon ability to handle complex matters. Thus master plans tend to see universities as offering graduate and the major professional training in law, medicine and scholarship. State colleges provide general education below university level and preparation in the minor professions of teaching, business and engineering. The junior colleges provide cheap lower-division work, general education for those not able to finish a four-year program, and technical-vocational education to prepare students for immediate employment. While states differ in the rigidity of this stratification, the concept is explicit or implicit in each master plan.

* A strong relationship is assumed to exist between university research and general social and economic well being. It is also assumed that this relationship is fostered in the state's senior institution(s).

* Once the premise is established that higher education is complex and costly, it is invariably argued that some form of coordination is essential.

While states differ on the desirable amount of coordination, at least four features characterize the intent of most master plans: They review and sometimes coordinate institutional budgets before submission to legislatures, review requests from institutions for new programs, establish standards for building and space utilization, and obtain data and conduct continuing studies of higher education within the state.

* On the assumption that people living in a complex society may change careers several times during their lifetime, some more elaborate provision is made for adult and continuing education.

* More explicit attention should be paid to the recruitment and training of college teachers.

Each master plan usually contains a few specific recommendations peculiar to the state. These may deal with clarification of an institution's mission, but generally, the argument and recommendations are similar.

Unfortunately, the validity of the assumptions is rarely questioned. Actually, each point can be seriously challenged. For example, California's goal of changing the mix of the state colleges and university by creating junior colleges has not been achieved. For the University of California in 1958, 31.9 per cent were lower division, 40.0 per cent upper division and 27.2 per cent graduate. In 1967 the percentages were 35.4 per cent lower division, 34.2 per cent upper division and 29.9 per cent graduate. The state colleges reflected a slightly different pattern but the lower division enrollments remained stable. In 1958, 27 per cent were lower division, 33.8 per cent upper division and 5 per cent graduate. In 1967, 28.7 per cent were lower division, 48 per cent upper division and 23.3 per cent graduate.[1]

There is no good evidence that participants in vocational programs actually enter the vocations they trained for. A recent study of technical-vocational students in several California junior colleges suggests that many graduates don't.

There have been no studies to indicate that elaborate coordination does or does not affect levels of state expenditure for higher education, percentage of a population attending college, cost of instruction or increased productivity of higher education. But here again, California data are instructive. In 1960-62, one out of every six freshmen were graduated. In 1965-67 exactly the same ratio prevailed, although for women it had become worse, 5.18 to 1 in 1960-62 and 6.5 to 1 in 1965-67.[2]

But such changes do not imply that the usual master plan recommendations are bad or inappropriate. Current opinion frequently indicates what people want. But plans which purport to be rational approaches to a serious problem ought to at least begin with rational assumptions.

---

[1] California Public Higher Education, A Statistical Profile 1920-1980, Barter McDonald & Co., Sept. 1967.

[2] Ibid.

Aside from the general suggestions, some that recur in the increasing number of master plan critiques seem relevant. One such theory holds that the improvement of master planning involves sharply defined objectives, the comprehension of dynamics in analyses of interrelation of survey data, computer science and the supplementation of fact-finding with more basic research.[1]

Paul L. Dressel has provided one of the more thoughtful criticisms of state survey and master planning:

> The ultimate value of a state survey depends not only on the quality of the recommendations but on the extent to which they are implemented. The status of the initiating group and the selection of the permanent guiding committee or commission are perhaps as important as the design and the survey staff. Since the latter cannot implement the survey findings, those directly responsible for implementation should be directly involved in carrying out the survey. This may be accomplished, on the one hand, by inclusion of some key individuals on the permanent committee (legislative committee chairman, for example) and, on the other, by *ad hoc* committees of institutional administrators or their representatives to develop definitions of the data to be collected and the procedures in processing them.
>
> When the budget is adequate (all too many surveys have been run on the proverbial shoestring), it is desirable to ask several experienced persons to serve as consultants in the planning stages. One of these may become the director. The continued use of consultants with evident agreement among them on the design and procedure of the study helps to ward off criticism, which will inevitably be leveled at the survey director by some institutions or persons who find procedures or emerging

---

[1] Owen A. Knorr, *Long Range Planning in Higher Education*, Boulder, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

results not to their liking. Parenthetically, it may be suggested that a survey which evokes no criticism has missed the really sensitive issues, although the presence of criticism is not insurance of success.

A good survey should provide data for reference and use in the future. Extensive and detailed data which go beyond the immediately apparent need may even be desirable. At the point of interpretation and summarization, questions often arise which are not readily answerable unless the data originally collected were recorded in some detail. One of the most obvious ways critics can attack the validity of survey results is by decrying the adequacy or reliability of the data collected.

Provisions should be made to have the findings of a survey printed in both a detailed format for reference purposes and a summary format for general, public distribution. Frequent, though certainly not premature, press releases help to maintain interest in a survey and pave the way toward careful examination of its findings.

One of the deficiencies of state surveys is their heavy dependence on quantifiable evidence. Qualitative differences in programs of institutions are largely ignored. Differences in costs, which in turn depend on faculty load, salary, and other factors, may be overemphasized without recognition that they may be accounted for by differences in quality. Unfortunately, there is no generally accepted measure of the quality of higher education programs. Any externally derived qualitative judgment of institutions will be controversial, for the quality of a college or university is always more apparent to its faculty than to anyone else. The truly high-caliber institutions may equally be placed at a disadvantage when unsophisticated or unprincipled individuals undertake to interpret data to suit their own purposes. Institutions in a stage of rapid development may also be placed at a disadvantage in that the actual nature of the student body and program may have undergone significant change within the one- to three-year period between data collection and appearance of the survey report. A coordinated annual program of basic data collection would be desirable and is now being developed in some states and regions where coordinating commissions or boards exist.

Despite the number of surveys conducted in recent years, very little has been done to assess their actual impact. Dramatic expansion of higher education opportunities in such states as Florida and California subsequent to one or more surveys suggests that surveys in those states were implemented. In other states, such as Michigan, implementation has been less dramatic and higher education developments which may have been given impetus by the report have been initiated largely by regional lay groups or by the institutions themselves. It is unfortunate that a study of the results of surveys has not been undertaken, partly to provide more objective indication of their worth, but also to examine in retrospect what data, information, and procedures were actually most productive in the various surveys.

Another aspect of the state or regional survey which deserves more attention is that of the utility of the survey results to individual institutions. When a legislature or a state coordinating unit for higher education takes action on survey recommendations, the impact is apparent. Rarely, however, do such actions extend far into the internal workings of the institution, although the power of the budget, especially of the line item budget, can hardly be overestimated. Private institutions, even when included in the survey, are less directly affected. All colleges and universities, private or public, could profitably use survey results in a critical restudy of their operations. Evidence of duplication of expensive courses or curricula in neighboring institutions should lead to discussions within and among the institutions involved. An institution listed as having such characteristics relative to its sister institutions as high faculty loads, low salaries, or many small classes should investigate whether they are clearly justified by local conditions. The consideration of these matters may demand further data. For example, an institution with high costs per credit hour would need to ascertain whether the cause is small classes, high salaries, programs which are inherently expensive because of special equipment and instructional practices, or some combination of these and other factors. One institution found that unusually high laboratory requirements were a factor of some significance. Unfortunately, institutions tend to be defensive, frequently to the point of being unwilling to believe or to look at the data. Even when surveys are principally aimed at determination of the need for new higher education units, the existing colleges and universities may be more concerned with the prospective competition for funds than with internal readjustments which will expedite the meeting of the broader need. Although close observers of the results of careful surveys in some states have concluded that all institutions benefitted budget-wise because of the

> increased understanding of and confidence in their operation and their needs, the initiation of a survey does not usually suggest that possibility. Ideally, some way should be found to make a survey more of a cooperative enterprise among the institutions involved, and to associate with it the characteristics and values of the institutional self-evaluation discussed in the following chapter. The lack of cooperation among institutions, or, more forthrightly, the competition among them, has undoubtedly been a major consideration in developing the stereotype of a survey as something done to the institutions of a state or region by presumably unbiased experts imported from outside the area. In many regions, one of the results has been that institutions have hastened to develop cooperative activities in a pattern of their own choosing, wisely deeming this course superior to cooperation enforced by law or by budgetary procedures. It is, therefore, entirely possible that the pattern of the state survey will change materially in the next decade or two. Legislatures, coordinating councils and boards, and the institutions themselves may come to see a continuing process of study as a basis for making decisions in which broad educational needs are given at least equal weight with the unique needs of the individual institutions.[1]

It now becomes necessary to examine in some detail coordination and planning activities which are actually in progress in the 50 states. The chapters which follow will attempt to elaborate.

---

[1] Paul L. Dressel & Associates, Evaluation in Higher Education, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

# Chapter II

## The Structure of Statewide Planning and Coordination

### Overview

It is difficult to generalize on the subject of statewide planning for coordination and control of higher education, but one common pattern involves a coordinating board appointed by a governor. That board, in turn, establishes a professional staff. The presidents of individual institutions report to the coordinating council on such matters as budget requests, plans for new programs, creation of new campuses and data upon which state long range planning might be based. The interrelationships between coordinating agencies and other agencies are largely informal and ad hoc, although the relationships between the staffs of a coordinating agency and the staffs of the several sectors of public higher education must be close and continuous.

In a few states specific associations have been assigned definite roles. In California, the Association of Independent Colleges and the California Junior College Association each nominates representatives to the Coordinating Council. And in a few states board members or officials from individual institutions hold *ex officio* posts on the coordinating body. On most state coordinating agencies, staff members must work with such offices as the budget director, legislative analyst or legislative committees on higher education. These relationships are actually mandated in only a few states. Typically, the executive officer of a coordinating agency reports recommendations to the governor and the legislature through its committees on higher education. Statewide agencies may maintain some informal contacts with regional associations, but once again, formal ties are not the rule. Within a state, interested associations may send representatives to open-coordination board meetings and receive minutes of those meetings, but this appears to happen at the volition of the association itself.

In Florida, the Board of Regents operates the state's seven senior institutions. When budget time arrives, the Board staff convenes a committee consisting of representatives of the institutions, the junior colleges and the bureau of the budget. This group works out broad guide lines on salary and other expenses, and prepares recommendations. The Chancellor lays these before the Council of Presidents, together with any judgments he may have. The modified guide lines will then be discussed in detail with the governor, budget director and other officers of the state government, and finally the budget is prepared and fed into the legislative machinery.

In California, the Boards of Regents or Trustees recommend budgets which are then reviewed by the staff of the Coordinating Council. The staff members may hold hearings and solicit opinions from interested associations or even institutions. The Council then recommends to the governor. However, the Boards of Regents may also make counter-recommendations, present arguments before legislative committees or seek to influence individual legislators.

In both Florida and California, on any given issue, interested organizations in the state may try to influence decisions. Thus the Florida chapter of the American Association of University Professors mounted a campaign to upgrade salaries and the California Senate of the State Colleges has sought to influence the tuition or fee issue. The regional compacts or accrediting associations try, as a matter of principle, to refrain from involving themselves in individual state or institutional planning. However, the compacts do indirectly influence planning by bringing planners and legislators together on the neutral ground of a conference or legislative workshop.

Planning or coordinating agencies are usually composed of laymen appointed by the governor. It would be impossible to tell to what extent individual members belong to policy-forming groups for other interested organizations, since most membership lists indicate only the affiliations of professional institution staff. Several states require a balance between political parties and several others specifically include officers of institutions, but these appear to be in a minority. Also in a minority are those states which include private education representatives as ex officio members of the planning board.

Apparently not all segments of society are represented in most states. In Colorado there are no Negro, Mexican American, or labor representatives on the state's Commission on Higher Education. But this is consistent with the history of boards in American education.

Membership has come most typically from the currently influential segments of society. At one time ministers, and at another time business leaders, seem to have held the balance of power on boards.

Coordinating or planning boards usually deal with a limited range of problems, although the amount of discretion allowed varies enormously from state to state. Boards are generally expected to review budget requests, but do not always prepare a consolidated budget. Almost all are expected to collect data and indicate long term higher education needs. Institutions usually must provide data on request. In general, boards are also expected to review requests for new programs and to give some attention to the role and scope of individual institutions or classes of institutions. Whether or not they have veto power, however, varies from state to state. Some boards must approve site selections for new institutions or branches while others may only recommend appropriate locations. Most bear the responsibility of long range master planning. This may consist of conducting continuous studies or the preparation of a single master plan. Since most agencies' responsibilities involve finance, they cannot make final decisions. The legislature and governor must maintain final authority. A few have enough power to make final recommendations to state government but the exercise of this power depends upon a board's or staff's ability to generate influence.

The matter of influence is one of the most serious problems facing coordinating or planning boards. The very existence of such an agency jeopardizes institutional independence. But there are other agencies. They operate between state government and institutions and must remain relatively independent of each other. To lean one way or the other would create antagonism on the part of the less favored.

Staffing has been a problem, both for the role of executive secretary and for subordinate officers. The executive secretary is generally expected to be the professional equal of senior institution heads, but the role lacks the prestige of a campus presidency. Furthermore, campus presidents are suspicious of a strong person at the head of a coordinating agency. A scarcity of research directors has affected the quality of available data. Vacancies have existed on several coordinating councils since their inception simply because qualified people were unavailable. Then, too, most of the agencies appear to be understaffed, a factor that precludes time for long range planning because available staff time must be used for such administrative tasks as budget review or site examination and selection.

Perhaps the greatest problem of all is that of developing a concept of a state system of higher education. It is so foreign to the American tradition that no relevant organizational theory really applies. For example, should coordinating agency's financial officer deal directly with a campus finance officer or not? How much freedom does a campus chancellor or president need to carry out his mission? How much should he be restricted for the sake of statewide objectives?

For the most part, the responsibility of these coordinating or planning agencies is limited to public higher education, although in theory they are supposed to cooperate with the private sector. But concern for private higher education is limited in all save a few states. States having a separate coordinating agency assign it responsibility for coordination of all levels of higher education (universities, state colleges and junior colleges). However, in those states emphasizing local boards of trustees for junior colleges, the amount of influence over those institutions is limited. Several states treat four and two-year colleges as distinct and different, especially where the senior institutions are controlled by a regental system. Florida and Arizona are examples. Table I of the appendix indicates the full range of state agencies.

Obviously, such a recently evolved concept as statewide institutional coordination and control would not be universally accepted, nor would those states accepting the concept be likely to agree on a particular format or structure. But we can identify three major patterns, each of which reflect at least two variations.

Agencies exercising statewide responsibility for coordination of higher education may be either separate boards, commissions or councils (there is no uniformity of language) or boards of trustees, regents or curators for state institutions assigned some statewide coordinating responsibilities.

A second type is found in those states which have assigned some higher education responsibilities to the state board of education. However, the state board of education may exercise its responsibilities alone or it may share them with one or more other agencies.

A second type is found in those states which have assigned some higher education responsibilities to the state board of education. However, the state board of education may exercise its responsibilities alone or it may share them with one or more other agencies.

The last category consists of those states that have no formal system of coordination. And again, two sub-types can be identified. Some states have a voluntary but definite system of coordination. Others can be best characterized as chaotic.

These are gross categories, and not even completely mutually exclusive, but they do provide a method of thinking about the problem of coordination. Table II of the appendix assigns states to categories and indicates the date of agency creation when one exists.

The subsequent discussion will consider statewide agencies in some detail and present several extended profiles of states which either have had a unique experience or are of such size as to reveal the problems of the large urban industrialized states. Briefer comment will be made about those states which rely on boards of education, voluntary coordination, or have no plan for statewide coordination or planning.

## Statewide Commissions' Roles and Responsibilities

Most statewide commissions are still defining their proper roles. Typically, they have been given responsibility for such activities as: creating a master plan, screening budget requests from individual institutions, developing long range facility plans, coordinating the activities of the various institutions of higher education, and making studies concerning higher education in the state.

The Arkansas Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance has coordinating and advisory responsibilities on matters related to budget requests, bond issues, and other financial matters. The Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education is the coordinating agency for all higher education, with specific responsibility for developing a master plan and submitting a single budget for all public institutions to the governor and legislature. The Ohio Board of Regents is also charged with developing a master plan, making budgetary recommendations, and approving or disapproving the development of new campuses. And the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education determines which institutions shall offer what programs, reviews institutional budgets, and is supposed to create an integrated plan for facilities construction throughout the state.

As yet few of these agencies exert final or binding authority over institutions. There are a few categorical exceptions. Apparently the Ohio Regents can block the creation of new branches. So can Texas' Coordinating Board, if it can muster sufficient political power. The California Coordinating Council offers a more typical pattern. Its approval is required on institutional budgets, but the university and state college system have the right to appeal directly to the legislature. Table I indicates the range of responsibilities for statewide coordinating agencies.

## TABLE I

### States With A Central Planning Agency

| | Identify Educ Needs of State | Needed Changes in Struct of H.E. | Approve Instit Expansion Plans | Approve Plan, Location Cost of New Instit | Define Role & Scope | Approve Operations of Individ Instit | Conduct Continuing Studies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 3 B | 3 C | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | | 3 B |
| California | 3 C | 3 C | 3 C | 6 B | 3 C | | 3 C |
| Colorado | 1 C | 1 C | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 C M<br>3 A N | 2 C<br>3 B |
| Connecticut | 1 C | 1 C | 3 C | 3 C | 3 | | 1 C |
| Illinois | 2 C<br>3 B | 3 A or B* | 3 B | 3 B | 3 A | 3 A* | 2 C<br>3 A |
| Kentucky | 3 B | 3 B | | 3 B | | | 1 C |
| Maryland | 1 C | 1 C | | 3 C | 1 C | | 1 C |
| Massachusetts | 3 | 3 | 3 B | 3 B | 3 A | | 3 |
| Minnesota | 1 C | 1 C | 3 C | 3 C | 1 C | | 1 C |
| Missouri | 1 C | 1 C | 1 C | 1 C | 1 C | 3 C | 1 C |
| New Jersey | 1 | 1 | 3 A | 3 A | | 3 | 1 |
| New Mexico | 1 C | 1 C | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B or C* | 2 C<br>3 B |
| New York | 1 A | 1 A | 1 A | 1 A | 1 A | 1 A | 1 A |
| North Carolina | 1 C | 1 C | 4 C | 4 C | 4 C | | 1 C |
| North Dakota | 4 B | 3 C | 4 B | 4 B | 4 A | 4 A or B* | 2+5 C<br>4 B |
| Ohio | 2 C<br>3 A* | 2 C<br>3 A | 3 C | 3 C | 3 C | | 3 C |
| Oklahoma | 2 C<br>3 A | 2 C<br>3 A | 3 B | 3 B | 3 A | | 2 C<br>3 A |
| Oregon | 1 C | 1 C | 1 C* | 1 C* | 1 C | | 1 C |
| South Carolina | 2 C<br>3 B | 2 C<br>3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 2 C<br>3 B |
| Tennessee | | | | | | | |
| Texas | 3 C | 3 C | 3 B | 3 B | 3 A | 3 B | 1 C |
| Utah | 3 B | 1 C | 3 B** | 3 B** | 3 B | 3 C | 1 C |
| Virginia | 3 B | | 3 C | 3 C | 3 B | | 3 A |
| Wisconsin | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | | 3 B |

Legend

M - Existing Curricula

N - New Curricula

* - Limited to specific items

** - Along with state agency planning

Authority

1 - For all public and private higher education
2 - For all private higher education
3 - For all public higher education
4 - For all 4 year public higher education
5 - For public 2 year colleges only

A - Final and binding authority
B - Final and binding authority subject to legislative approval
C - Advisory powers only

It should be noted that these powers are assigned or implied. The degree to which they are actually exercised depends on such factors as state traditions, the powers of institutional presidents, or the influence of an agency's executive head. Thus the Colorado commission has the power to disapprove institutional expansion plans, but an institution could muster sufficient strength in the legislature to override a commission recommendation. The same is true in California and Illinois.

## Responsibilities for Private Higher Education

These agencies, regardless of the degree of authority, are concerned most directly with public higher education. Typically, relationships with private institutions or associations of private institutions are voluntary in character.

In Wisconsin the Executive Director of the Coordinating Committee meets with the presidents of private institutions. In Colorado frequent conversations are held between the state commission's executive director and officials of private institutions. Oklahoma's private institutions may become affiliated with the Board of Regents, and California's appoint three members to the state Coordinating Council. A similar pattern obtains in Minnesota where two private college presidents serve on the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

Only in New York does the Board of Regents wield legal authority over private institutions through the accrediting functions. Officials in the coordinating agencies speak of good relationships with private institutions. But most presidents of private universities claim that they conduct their planning without particular reference to state committees or commissions. And the governor of one state says he feels most governors are not really concerned about private education.

## Source of Authority

Typically, state coordinating agencies are created and funded through legislative enactment, although several were created by constitutional amendment. A South Carolina law, effective July 1, 1967, created a seven-member Commission on Higher Education and assigned it the duties of studying role and scope, enrollment trends, curricular offerings and necessary areas of cooperation. The Commission was also directed to establish a Council of Presidents, recommend budgetary policies to the legislature, and review budget requests from individual institutions. The law requires an annual report to the governor and General Assembly on the progress of higher education.

Presumably, an agency created by the legislature has only the power to recommend to the legislature or can exercise only those powers expressly granted by the legislature. In Oklahoma, however, the Board of Regents was created by an amendment to the state constitution. This provides that the Board shall prescribe standards, determine courses of study, authorize the awarding of degrees, recommend institution budgets, and recommend to the legislature proposed fees for all institutions. It receives a lump sum appropriation from the legislature and then allocates portions of it to each institution.

## Age of Coordinating Agencies

Most statewide coordinating agencies are products of the 1960's, created in response to the enormous demand for higher education caused by the World War II population increase.[1] As the California experience suggests, a state usually commissions one or more studies of its higher education needs, using existing agencies as an instrument or contracting with some outside group. In Colorado, the blueprint for a commission-style system was developed in 1962 by the Association of State Institutions. The Study Commission on Higher Education in Connecticut conducted studies in 1965, which culminated in legislation that created the Commission for Higher Education that same year. The first Kentucky study began in 1964 and the report was submitted in January, 1966. Its central recommendation was the creation of a nine voting-member Council on Public Higher Education which would then assume the task of coordinating public higher education. Massachusetts created a special commission of 72 members. Eleven of these were legislators, five public school administrators, and four representatives of higher education, all of whom served under the direction of an outside consultant. The broad plan was developed between 1962-64 and legislation passed in 1965.

---

[1] See Table II of Appendix.

## Development Process of Statewide Coordination

Several states have conducted studies that produced somewhat similar recommendations. New Jersey, for example, conducted a series of studies without achieving a system, and in Michigan, a citizens' committee study was followed by a legislative-supported consultants' study which, in turn, was followed by a series of studies and recommendations, none of which resulted in a formal coordinating agency.

The basic reasons for such delays are usually the obvious ones. Statewide coordination implies some loss of institutional independence, and is therefore considered reluctantly and conditionally by individual colleges and universities. President Frank Rose of the University of Alabama, for example, says he would support coordination only if certain fundamental concerns of the University were protected. Often, a relatively inexpensive study serves in lieu of definite action to solve a state's higher education problems. This seems especially to have been true in New Jersey. Rivalry between boards of trustees has also served to defeat recommendations. Studies that frequently urge the expansion of public higher education pose a threat to the private sector. And then some of the studies themselves appear almost pro forma exercises.

Maryland seems fairly typical in the progress of its planning. Its Advisory Council for Higher Education is responsible for review of the budgets submitted by individual institutions, for recommendation regarding new facilities and programs, and for studies of higher education in the state.

The first phase of a master plan has been drafted but that consisted of general guide lines, plus a few specific recommendations. Apparently specific recommendations for a separate community colleges board have encountered serious opposition from the Maryland Teachers Association and the State Department of Education.

## Powers of Coordinating Agencies

According to the pattern, state study is gradually followed by legislative creation of some form of coordinating agency which begins to develop a master plan and to evolve policies and procedures which will enable it to exert influence on the state's educational system. Sensitive to institutional needs for independence, these plans call only for broad policy in such things as faculty salaries, student financial aid, and, of course, cooperation between public and private higher education. But that can hardly be called influential. The number and location of each institution's responsibilities, the curricula and degrees to be offered and the methods for finances and capital expenditures are judged to be essential responsibilities for coordinating agencies. There is less general agreement that the board or commission should indicate the ultimate size of institutions, the source of operating funds, whether or not there should be experimental colleges or whether or not institutions should be assigned constitutional status.

To illustrate, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education has no governing powers, but it does assume review and recommending powers over budgets, and establishes building construction standards, approves sites and recommends construction priorities.

The Connecticut Commission on Higher Education has similar duties and responsibilities, and in Massachusetts, the Board of Higher Education is also charged with developing effective coordination among public institutions of higher education and reviewing operating and capital budgets for public institutions.

The Colorado, Connecticut and Massachusetts agencies are slightly younger than the Illinois Board of Higher Education and do not wield similarly definite prerogatives. Since all public four-year institutions are legally coordinated by the Illinois Board, the chairman of each institution's governing group is a member of the Board of Higher Education. Major provisions of the state's master plan have been adopted into law, although the statewide association of private institutions has begun to resist enactment of some elements of the master plan's Phase II. The Illinois board currently sets broad policy for student entrance requirements, role and scope of institution, faculty salaries, the location of new institutions, the creation of experimental colleges and the need for continuous planning. It makes specific recommendations to the legislature concerning the number of institutions the state should maintain, financing of experimental colleges and the need for continuous planning, financing of facilities, student financial aid, the governance of higher education and which institutions may offer what degrees.

A. J. Brumbaugh has outlined the purposes of statewide coordination as:[1]

- Identification of immediate and long-range post-secondary educational needs of the state.
- Identification of changing economic conditions and exploration of their implications for changes in the structure of higher education.
- Approval of plans, needs and resources of existing higher institutions and planning new institutions and facilities when needed.
- Definition of the role and scope of colleges and universities.
- Appraisal and approval of individual institutions operation.
- Conducting continuous studies about all facets of higher education.

Almost all agencies contend they are concerned with all six purposes for public higher education. They also say that they are concerned with long range educational goals, changing economic conditions and continuing studies of higher education as they affect all higher education, both public and private, within a state. They seem, however, to be almost evenly split as to whether they see their responsibilities as advisory or as binding, subject to legislative approval.

## Institutional Reaction to Coordination

Institutional reaction to the assumption of such responsibilities by state agencies seems mixed. In states such as Massachusetts and Missouri, state university officials say they wish the agency would develop power and create guide lines so that individual institutions could plan more effectively. In states such as Wisconsin, where a strong university traditionally dominates, the state commission is tolerated for routine matters but lacks the power to deny the university its will in significant matters. In California, the Coordinating Council is regarded as a help and a hindrance to institutional development, but published reactions are generally favorable.

---

[1] A. J. Brumbaugh, State Wide Planning and Coordination. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

Most planning documents, state surveys and recommended master plans seem to agree on the need for some state agency to insure better allocation of resources for higher education. But the techniques for limiting institutional sovereignties are not well established. Hence, agencies are moving slowly in order to avoid alienating the universities. It is also suspected that large universities have been fearful that an overly aggressive state coordinating board director might try to meddle in their affairs. The chairman of one commission remarked that the executive director's greatest success had been keeping the agency going during its first three years. Had he been too aggressive, the institutions would have defeated his agency; had he done nothing, the legislature would have eliminated it.

## Specificity of Assigned Responsibilities

Legislation creating statewide agencies exhibits a wide range of specificity and powers given to the board or reserved to individual institutions. Given the history of higher education in America, it could be theorized that Western states grant greater specific powers to their agencies than Eastern states, simply because Western states are traditionally more heavily involved in public higher education.

But the legislative provisions in Massachusetts and Connecticut appear more binding than those in Missouri and Colorado, while the New Jersey legislation seems to allow institutions more latitude than that of Texas or Oklahoma. It is this lack of uniformity in state legislation which makes generalization difficult about even a single category of statewide coordination. And the cloudiness of legislative provisions for several of the states makes an agency's task of feeling out an appropriate role for itself quite difficult.

The Missouri act establishing the Missouri Commission on Higher Education seems among the most permissive regarding the rights of individual institutions. This is probably responsible for the uncertainties that surround the long-range planning of several of Missouri's new comprehensive universities. The Commission simply lacks the power to establish hard guide lines. The law gives the Commission responsibility, within constitutional provisions, for conducting population and enrollment studies, identifying higher education needs, developing arrangements for effective and economical specialization among institutions, and designating a coordinated plan for higher education. It does not request institutions to submit policy changes; recommend to institutions regarding creation, consolidation or elimination of programs and recommend formulae for requesting appropriation. The Commission is required only to create an advisory committee which meets once a year to discuss long range plans for higher education.

The Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education has been granted more power but lacks detailed specifications on operating methods. Colorado and New Jersey seem midway between relative permissiveness and definite prescription. The New Jersey Department of Higher Education was created as a principal department of the executive branch of state government and is given general authority and specific instructions for long range planning and coordination of higher education. Colorado established the Colorado Commission on Higher Education with the avowed intention of making higher educational opportunities as available as possible, avoiding duplication of effort, and achieving simplicity of operation. Recognition of and concern for the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of institutional boards is expressed throughout the legislation.

A much stronger role for the state agency seems anticipated by the legislation developed in Texas, Connecticut and Massachusetts. The Texas provisions are especially informative. Its coordinating board "...shall represent the highest authority in the state in matters of public higher education...," has the authority to define systems of higher education, classify and prescribe institution role and scope, review programs to insure they meet the needs of the state, order initiation, consolidation or elimination of degree programs, and require that each institution shall annually submit a listing of all courses with the understanding that the board can order the deletion or consolidation of any. The Connecticut legislation creating a Commission for Higher Education assigns similar broad areas of responsibility and then provides for hearings on disagreements between the Commission and an individual institution. The Commission's decision then becomes binding on the institution. The mandate of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education provides broad powers but clearly reserves determination of individual courses to each institution.

## Composition of State Coordinating Agencies

Specified or prohibited board membership reflects varying size, philosophy and appointing power. (See Tables IV and VI of appendix.)

A sampling of states indicates the breadth of the compositional spectrum.

Massachusetts' coordinating body includes board members of specified institutions, as well as seven members appointed by the governor. But the governor must appoint a representative of organized labor and at least two women. No two members may be graduates of the same public institution and no institutional employees may serve. Tenure is for five years with a two-term limitation.

Colorado tries to prevent partisan domination by specifying that no more than four of its seven-member board may belong to the same political party. Members are appointed to four-year terms and no member, when appointed, may be an employee or board member of any public institution.

New Jersey, on the other hand, seeks an institutional point of view. The chairman of the Board of Budgets, Newark College of

Engineering, the Council of State Colleges, the Council of Country Colleges, the State Board of Education and a representative of private institutions serve on the Board of Higher Education with nine lay citizens. At least two members must be women. Appointed members serve for six years and members are to be appointed without regard for their political belief or application.

Missouri specifies that its ten-member board may have no more than three members of the same political party, no two from the same Congressional District, and no more than two may be graduates from the same college within the state. No employee or board member of a collegiate institution within the state may serve.

The New York State Board of Regents consists of 14 laymen elected by the state legislature for terms of 14 years. The appointed head holds the title, President of the University of the State of New York, and is also head of the State Department of Education.

Illinois has a 13-member board. Eight members are appointed by the governor. The others are chairmen of the Boards of the University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University, other state universities, the State College, the Illinois Junior College Board, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Terms for appointed members are for six years.

Maryland has an Advisory Council for Higher Education which is presumed to be an agency of the legislature, governor and the people of the state. It is composed of representatives of all public institutions in the state.

California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education has gone farthest in trying to bring all segments of higher education, public and private, into close association. Of its 18 members, three are nominated by the Regents of the University of California, and three by the Trustees of the State Colleges. Three represent junior colleges, three represent private higher education and six are appointed by the governor to represent the state at large.

Generalizations about the composition of statewide coordinating boards are impossible at this writing. They may be reflective of the public interest, institutional interest or both. They are largely appointive, although a governor may or may not be free to appoint whom he wishes. Generally, the advice and consent of the legislature is required. There appears to be no standard term of office. Subjectively, the boards of California, Illinois and New York seem to have been most productive in creating, or at least working with, a complex system of higher education. Two of these involve some institutional representation, while one elects to have lay membership. However, that one, New York, maintains a key educational official as presiding officer who represents institutional interests. In the absence of any empirical data, it could be argued that a board, lacking institutional representation, might be insensitive to the complexities of higher education and hence would fall short of total effectiveness. Such a thorny issue, however, should really be studied in detail against a background of relevant management and political science theory.

## Relationships with Other Agencies

Although these statewide boards or commissions are considered central in higher education planning, they must function within the web of state government and the bureaucracy of institutional, state, regional and national higher education. But there seems to be no definite pattern to the process. The rule is apparently that of overlapping membership, some legal relationships and just informal consultation.

The relationships between the boards or councils and other state agencies reflect a particularly mixed series of arrangements. Five members of the Wisconsin Coordinating Committee for Higher Education are members of the Higher Educational Aids Commission, which distributes scholarships and Federal facilities assistance. The staff of Illinois' Board of Higher Education is represented on the planning committee for the State Technical Services Act. In Utah, a State Planning Office works with the various state agencies, including the Coordinating Council of Higher Education, in an effort to perfect planning methods and exchange useful information. South Dakota and Minnesota each have a similar arrangement.

Because statewide boards generally have some responsibility for the review of financial affairs, a board or its staff must maintain close ties with the state central fiscal control unit. In North Carolina, for example, the Board of Higher Education must make its budget recommendations to the Director of the Budget and the Advisory Budget Commission. The Director apparently has the power to reduce appropriations, thus causing the Board to revise its budget.

There is generally presumed to be some kind of relationship between a higher education agency and a state department of education. This may be an organic one, as in New Jersey. The Strayer Commission there was subordinate to the Board of Education until 1967 when it became a distinct department. Or, it can be just a presumed relationship, as in Missouri. The Missouri Commission reports, "It is currently not too clear what the relationship should be between the Commission and the State Board. We work together pretty much on an ad hoc basis in the public junior college area."

The relationships between boards of higher education and regional planning groups are equally varied. The several regional compacts--Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Southern Regional Education Board and the New England Board of Higher Education--are frequently cited. The Illinois Board confers informally with the North Eastern Illinois Planning Commission and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, which works to develop cooperation and grants among the Big Ten institutions and the University of Chicago.

Several states indicate that reports and statistics provided by Federal agencies, commissions in other states, and various other sources are valuable in planning. The Virginia State Council of Higher Education participates in the Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia. The New York Board of Regents must work with state planning agencies, such as the Governor's Office of

Planning Coordination, and with agencies of the City of New York, such as the Regional Planning Association of New York City. The New Jersey Division of Higher Education acts as advisor to several agencies, such as the Research and Development Association of New Jersey and the Admissions Officers and Guidance Association of New Jersey. It is perhaps of considerable significance that only one state board--the South Carolina Commission--reports relationships with the Compact of States. Table VIII of the appendix indicates the various interrelationships reported as operative by coordinating agencies.

State boards and commissions tend to use various sorts of advisory committees for coordination and obtaining relevant opinions from certain segments of a state's population. These may be specified in enabling legislation, as in Massachusetts or New Jersey, or simply in the creation of the board itself, as in Illinois and California. The Illinois Board maintains Citizens', Presidents' and Faculty Advisory Committees. Massachusetts has created several different advisory committees dealing with such matters as improving the performance of all public educational systems and attempting to eliminate racial imbalance. Colorado also has an advisory committee legislated "...for the purpose of suggesting solutions for the problems and needs of higher education and maintaining liaison with the general assembly and their inspection boards..."

Published documents and questionnaire responses concerning relationships between state boards or commissions leave the distinct impression that agencies are still so new that lines of communication still have to be established.

## Single Boards for Governance and Coordination

A cluster of 12 states has elected, for various reasons, to assign some responsibility for statewide planning to a single institution's board of trustees, or to a board of regents controlling several institutions. In some states the reasons for this are obvious. In Delaware and Alaska the state is so small or the population so sparse that a more complicated machinery would be, if not ridiculous, at least unnecessary. But this reason scarcely applies to Arizona and Georgia, which are experiencing substantial population increases. Table II lists these 12 states and indicates the responsibilities assigned to the Boards.

These boards typically derive their powers from an act of the legislature (there are no constitutional universities within the group) and assume their long range planning mission on the basis of powers granted to conduct one or more institutions. But there are exceptions. In both Georgia and Florida, special commissions have from time to time recommended that the board become more active in long range planning or that the professional staffs appointed to aid the board be expanded to accommodate the planning mission.

The Board of Regents for Alaska was created and established as a corporation. As such it does not report to any administrative

## TABLE II

### States With a Single Board That Both Governs and Plans

| | Identify Educ Needs of State | Needed Changes in Struct of H.E. | Approve Instit Expansion Plans | Approve Plan, Location, Cost of New Instit | Define Role & Scope | Approve Operations of Individ Instit | Conduct Continuing Studies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alaska | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A |
| Arizona | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B | 3 B |
| Delaware | No Data | | | | | | |
| Florida | 3 C | 3 C | 3 B | 3 B | 3 A | 3 A | 3 C |
| Georgia | 3 A | 3 C | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A |
| Hawaii | 3 | 3 C | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A |
| Iowa | 4 A | 4 A | 4 A | 4 A | 4 A | 4 A | 4 A |
| Mississippi | 4 B | 4 C | 4 C | 4 C | 4 A | 4 A | 4 |
| Nevada | No Data | | | | | | |
| New Hampshire | No Data | | | | | 4 A | |
| Rhode Island | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A | | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A |
| Kansas | | | | | | | |

Legend

Authority
- 1 - For all public and private higher education
- 2 - For all private higher education
- 3 - For all public higher education
- 4 - For all 4 year public higher education
- 5 - For public 2 year colleges only

- A - Final and binding authority
- B - Final and binding authority subject to legislative approval
- C - Advisory powers only

authority for review. Of course, requests for appropriations are presented to the governor. During the past several years this board has accepted a master campus plan, created three community colleges, established three research institutes and conducted an elaborate study of the needs for continuing adult education.

In Arizona an eight-member Board of Regents governs the three-institution university system. This board may enact ordinances, appoint officers, set salaries and retirement systems, fix tuition and fees, establish curricula, award degrees and remove officers or employees from their duties.

Rhode Island also uses and praises a single Board of Trustees for state colleges. The Board itself has used outside consultants to project physical plant facilities and review individual institutional academic plans, and tries to coordinate resources for the future. Its most recent positive step in this direction was the appointment of a chancellor who assumed office in January 1968. This last move was unquestionably part of a drive by the president of the University of Rhode Island to combine all institutions into one, thus creating a centralized administration as well as a single board. In a sense President Horn was seeking what Delaware already has. In that state a single University is responsible to a single board: "...in charting its development the University has been, to a very considerable extent, planning for the higher education of the state as a whole....Delaware already very nearly has what many states are now trying to develop--a comprehensive system of higher education."[1]

---

[1] The University of Delaware Looks Ahead, June 1963.

Relatively small states such as Rhode Island or Delaware, or sparsely populated states such as Alaska, can function effectively with a single institution or a single board, but as states and systems become larger and more complex, problems begin to develop. Georgia is a case in point. All of its state-supported institutions are governed by a single board legally vested with almost complete authority. This board now operates 23 junior colleges, colleges, universities or separate professional schools. The system has functioned effectively for more than three decades: through the Depression, World War II and the period of expansion during the 1950's and 1960's. Now, however, with the multiplication of institutions and the diversification of their programs, there is some question whether the central staff can perform its broad functions.

Rather than shift to multiple boards, however, Georgia's university system has begun to increase its central staff, undertake long range planning and accumulate better information. The board is conscious of the threat that a bloated central staff could pose to institutional initiative, authority and autonomy, and is attempting to set policies which will prevent this from happening. It has created an office of institutional research to identify long range problems and needs, develop long range means for meeting those needs, encourage colleges to experiment, and conduct special studies for the Board. Chief among these special inquiries are a series of role and scope studies coupled with manpower studies.

Sometimes a single board can develop monopolistic tendencies, fearing to jeopardize the status quo by looking to the future. Kansas is caught in such a situation. The State Board of Education conducts its public school and junior college system. The state universities and state colleges are operated under the Board of Regents, which is a lay board without adequate staff or funds. Each institution has been allowed to move at its own pace and in its own direction. The Board has commissioned at least nine major statewide studies of higher education since 1922, the last of which was made in 1962.[1] "The studies were made, the reports were accepted, the material was read, then it was filed. Higher education in Kansas continued to march on much as before."[2] The situation had not changed appreciably by March, 1967.

In some respects, Hawaii should find itself in a situation similar to that of Kansas or Georgia. It has a rapidly expanding population and economy, a land mass distributed among islands of varying size, and a multi-ethnic population. It operates its university, extension centers, research installations, branch campuses and a junior college system through a board of regents and a single president. Yet the system has not run into trouble and the president reports that he foresees no future change in basic structure.

---

[1] _Kansas: Plans for the Next Generation_, Topeka, Board of Regents, 1962.

[2] _Ibid_., 7.

The Board of Regents is apparently willing to react to broad policies, help represent the university to the legislature and leave the actual conduct of the university to the president. He, in turn, has solicited outside help in planning new campuses, in meeting such vexing problems as inadequate residential facilities on the main campus, and in studying the state's economy. He has inspired long range academic planning which has produced several of the most thorough and responsible statements yet encountered. The president keeps the Board informed of planners' suggestions, and seems to have the ability to carry it along with what he proposes.

We possess relatively few empirically-based criteria with which to assess control boards holding some degree of responsibility for statewide planning. The situations of the states within this category are so different that generalizations are completely unwarranted. However, several theoretical matters can be raised.

Generally, the existence of several independent institutions under one board is a potential source of trouble. Particularly in Florida, Rhode Island and Kansas, each institution seems to feel defensive toward others in the system, and seeks to exploit its own plans, even at the expense of sister institutions. This tendency is apparent even in California, which employs a coordinating council but places the state colleges under one board.

The comments of state college officers reveal considerable resentment toward the board of trustees and its planning efforts.

The same degree of unrest is not present in the University of California's branches, which operate under the Regents and a central administration. One cannot help sympathizing with the former president of the University of Rhode Island, who sensed that the state's educational mission could be better met if there were only one state institution consisting of several branches. The relative tranquility of Hawaii and Delaware seems to point in that direction. Thus, it could be suggested that where conditions warrant lodging long range planning and institutional control in the same board, a single administration for the university and its component parts is preferable to multiple and equal administrations.

But who actually does the planning? The parent institutions and their staffs do it in Delaware and Hawaii. Thus they are able to bring the full intellectual and financial resources of their universities to bear on the planning function.

In Georgia and Kansas, a lack of resources and adequate board of regents staff prevented serious long range projections. Georgia's solution was similar to Florida's, i.e., enlarge the staff. But there is always the danger that a large central staff undermines the necessary authority and independence of individual institutions.

In Kansas, the need for more planning staff was clear enough. But the solution was to allow the institution staffs to plan, while denying them real independence. Ultimate control still rested with the Board of Regents. The board then had to make decisions on the basis of no planning data, or data presented in a competitive way. Again, these few examples suggest that under a board of trustees endowed with statewide planning responsibilities, an institutional planning agency, accountable to a central administration, is preferable to a separate agency responsible to the board.

According to one point of view, the study and planning function of a structure should be separated from the operations or implementation function. This viewpoint seems to underly the creation of suprainstitutional boards, legally enjoined to make each institution ultimately responsible for its own operations. However, another theory holds that the act of planning requires accountability for decisions. One can suspect that faculty self-studies are frequently ineffective because academicians are not responsible for finances, nor for ultimate implementation.

It is likely the pattern of the states in this group will not find acceptance in large states with growing populations. But in several of the smaller New England states, the Delaware pattern would seem to have much to commend it.

A single board structure is clearly less complex than a system involving a coordinating commission and institutional boards. One would expect the inter-relationships with other agencies to be correspondingly simple. Tabulation (Table III) supports this premise.

## TABLE III

### STATES WITH A SINGLE BOARD THAT BOTH GOVERNS AND PLANS

### Inter-relationships With Other Planning Groups

| | Pub 4 yr Univ | Pub 4 yr Coll | Pub 2 yr Coll | Private Coll Univ | State HEFA Board | State Planning Board | State Dept Ed | State Dept Fin. | Assoc Priv Coll Univ | Re-fional Boards | Consul-tants | Reg Off HEW | Federally Supported Research Lab |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alaska | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Arizona | 2 | * | #3AE | 8 | | | | | | 3 4 | 4 | | |
| Delaware | 2 | | 2 | | | | | | 8 | 3 4 | 8 | | |
| Florida | 2 | * | #3E | 8 | | | | | | | 4 | | |
| Georgia | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 | | | 3E | 3E | | 3 4 | 4 | | |
| Hawaii | 2 | * | 2 | | 3E | | | | | 3 4 | | | |
| Iowa | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | A | | 3 | | | 3 | 4 | | |
| Mississippi | 2 | 2 | #6E | ** | 6E | | | | 3 | 3 | | | |
| Nevada | 2 | * | | | | | | | E | 3BE | 4 | | |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 3E | 3E | | | | | 4 | | |
| Wyoming | NO DATA | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Legend

There are no institutions of this nature or designation
Governed by its own independent board
* Agency acts as the official State Agency for the Guaranteed Program and the Community Services Title of the H.E.A. for both public and private junior and senior colleges.

See attached code sheet.

## TABLE III
(Continued)

## CODE FOR INTER-RELATIONSHIPS OF PRIMARY PLANNING AGENCY WITH OTHER PLANNING GROUPS

1. Coordinates - has legal responsibility to bring about concerted and common action.

2. Has legal responsibility for - is the primary state level agency concerned with both coordination and institutional supervision,

3. Maintains, or receives from, voluntary cooperation and consultation.

4. Contractual.

5. Advises and recommends - does not have the authority to coordinate.

6. Frequent formal consultation - characterizes the relationship between the agency and some other state agency with major planning responsibility. Lacks the authority of coordination but is more formal and mandatory than voluntary cooperation and consultation.

7. Has a licensing and/or accrediting function.

8 None, or usually none.

A. Has at least one member in common with the other agency.

B. Uses representatives of the other agency on advisory or study committees.

C. No overlapping membership with other agencies.

D. Members of the PRIMARY agency serve on the board or advisory committee of the other agency.

E. The other agency also influences the PRIMARY agency's planning.

## Coordination Through Boards of Education

Although a number of state education or public instruction boards bear responsibility for some segments of higher education, e.g., state teachers colleges, state colleges or junior colleges, only a few have statewide coordinating responsibility for several categories of institutions. Among these, Oregon is unique.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education, which consists solely of four-year public institutions, is governed by the State Department of Higher Education. This agency, created in 1929, has sought to prevent unnecessary program duplication, improve the quality of specialized programs and improve the curricula at each institution through insuring a balance of program and institutional resources. The nine members of the board are appointed by the Governor for six-year terms. The Oregon State Board of Education oversees the two-year community colleges. The efforts of these two agencies, as well as those of private institutions, are coordinated to some degree by the Educational Coordinating Council, which was formed by the legislature in 1965. The Governor appoints as many council members as he wishes, they serve at his pleasure, and are intended as broadly representative of the state's public and private institutions. The council coordinates by advising institutional boards and undertakes studies. It is composed of six laymen and four employees of educational institutions. Two of the laymen are members of the State Board of Education. Two are members of the

State Board of Higher Education, one is an employee of the Department of Finance and Administration, and one is a citizen at large. This council has completed a major statewide study but the two state boards seem to perform the real coordination.

Through interlocking memberships, the Chancellor of the State Department of Higher Education and the Superintendent of the State Department of Education are members of the Coordinating Council; a great deal of coordination is maintained within the two public sectors. And through informed contacts as well as participation in the Coordinating Council, the private institutions are kept abreast of developments. Eventually, however, the Educational Coordinating Council is expected to assume considerable influence.

The State of Oregon Educational Coordinating Council is a relatively new agency. Its relationships with other agencies have not yet been fully designed. In addition to acting as the administrative agency for several Federal programs, the Council is expected to:

- Coordinate planning and evaluative efforts of related agencies to insure that efforts of related agencies may be effectively integrated.
- Ensure that some agency identifies and plans for all of the state's needs.
- Establish inter-agency procedures that will, whenever feasible, provide for the simultaneous development of data and information essential for planning at the agency and statewide level.

- Develop, in cooperation with related agencies, a statewide master plan for presentation to the Governor and the legislature.

- Establish regulatory procedures for evaluation and periodic revision of the master plan.

- Evaluate the progress of the various state educational programs in the light of the adopted master plan and make recommendations to ensure that each educational level and element receives appropriate emphasis.

- Make periodic progress reports to the Governor's office on the status of comprehensive planning.

Other agencies responsible for higher education planning are expected to continue their internal planning and evaluation, and to provide the Council with basic data related to the respective agencies.

Michigan is one of the few large, wealthy and growing states that lacks a well developed plan for coordination of higher education. Possibly because of the state's two powerful and jealous universities (Michigan and Michigan State), no system has developed, despite many recommendations for one. Instead, the Department of Education maintains a Bureau of Higher Education, which serves as the staff for the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges. The department is supposed to bear responsibility for all of public higher education. However, since the senior universities have constitutional existence and their boards are charged with operating them, statewide planning is likely to be ineffectual unless suggestions conform to the desires of the senior universities. Appendix Tables IX and X compare the authority of boards of education.

## Voluntary or No Coordination

While officials in several states claim that the state maintains a voluntary system of coordination, Indiana is really the only one in which a system has operated for some time.

Indiana supports two universities--Purdue and Indiana University --which in turn administer regional campuses, technical institutes, urban or cooperative centers, state colleges (operating under the Indiana State College Board) and one junior college. In addition, Indiana has approximately 32 private institutions.

Some 20 years ago, a Post-High School Education Study Commission, consisting of 17 state legislators and pressure group representatives, reported to the governor and legislature that Indiana had no recommendation regarding a formal coordinating or fact-finding agency. The Commission commended the voluntary arrangement which operates under the title of The Indiana Conference of Higher Education.

In operation since 1945, this conference now functions under a constitution which says its purpose is "...to provide for discussion and create understanding of the problems of higher education as they relate to the colleges and universities in Indiana; and to provide an organization by which decisions can be made on policy matters involving cooperative action among all Indiana institutions of higher education."[1] It is a loosely knit organization without specific authority, originally created to provide a forum for discussing the problems of veteran enrollment. The conference seeks to insure that all qualified youth are given educational opportunities, and that an exact balance be maintained between enrollments in public and private institutions. It provides a channel for the discussion and solution of common problems, and is intended to utilize existing facilities and minimize competition between institutions.

---

[1] Raleigh W. Holmstedt, The Indiana Conference of Higher Education 1945-1965, Bulletin of the School of Education, Bloomington, Ind. Jan. 1967. The Constitution was adopted in 1955 and amended in 1959 and 1962.

Beyond the commonly accepted goal of increasing faculty salaries, the conference seeks ways of effectively using tax and private dollars. It conducts studies and then uses the generally accepted findings as a basis for institution policy-making. For example, after the conference developed statewide enrollment projections, each college president made long range plans to accommodate the predicted increases.

Although the conference is voluntary, the Indiana General Assembly has given legislative force to cooperation among its members. Beginning in 1949, a clause was inserted in the annual budget bill, ordering state-supported institutions to prepare a joint request for operating funds. This joint effort requires all four institutions to project enrollments and work out formulae so that each may obtain its fair percentage of the total appropriation. Indiana and Purdue Universities have also cooperated in the creation of regional campuses and in the expansion of those already in existence. The universities also plan their educational programs jointly. A Statewide Educational Program Committee tries to avoid duplication of course and program offerings.

The results of these voluntary cooperative efforts are reported to the Indiana Conference. Similarly, the work of other voluntary agencies is also reported to the Conference. Included in this group are the College and University Public Relations Association, The Indiana Association of College and University Business Officers, The Indiana Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the Scholarship Association of Indiana Colleges and Universities, the Indiana Student Health Association, and The High School-College Cooperative Committee. These provide enough staff work to make the conference plausible as a coordinating agency.

Reactions to the conference are mixed. Raleigh W. Holmstedt holds that

> Institutional resources have been more fully utilized, and plans for growth and expansion have been more realistic and effective than would have been possible if the cooperative relationships had not been developed. There has been greater understanding and appreciation of the aims and purposes of the individual institutions, competition and controversy have been reduced, and common problems have been solved. The public and private institutions have been brought together in a working relationship that has given unity to higher education in Indiana and at the same time has preserved the diversity that is essential to an adequate and effective system of higher education. Perhaps the most important value of all has been the spirit of confidence and good will which has characterized the inter-institutional relationships in the Conference throughout its history....[1]

But another viewpoint is revealed in a letter from an Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction:

---

[1] Holmstedt, _op_. _cit_., 37.

> We do not have a State Planning Committee of any kind. We are not a member of any type of planning committee. Moreover, we have not made any projections as to assumptions that might underlay a state plan...I can tell you here and now that I don't like it. I wish we could be of more help and that we might have some good concrete information which would reflect progress on the part of Indiana educators, particularly the State Department of Public Instruction. I had hoped that we could get moving in the right direction by this time. If the colleges and universities have made any move toward the formulation of a plan of higher education, I have no knowledge of it.

One group of states has no statewide coordination of higher education. The group includes Alabama, Iowa, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia and Wyoming. While several of these states make some attempt at voluntary coordination, most adopt an almost complete laissez-faire attitude regarding the conduct of individual institutions.

In Nebraska, the University of Nebraska, the Trustees of the State Normal Schools and the Board of Regents for the University of Omaha (municipal) maintain a voluntary coordinating council. Legislation to create a State Coordinating Council on Higher Education is pending. For the moment, the relationships between institutions are best described as casual. A Nebraska Association of Colleges and Universities meets from time to time and allows some discussion between private and public institutions. Apparently the greatest single influence on institutional planning is the Legislative Budget Committee which exerts a significant pull on development by controlling appropriations. Vermont also exhibits similar lack of system.

Neither West Virginia or New Hampshire deviates sufficiently from the pattern to warrant further comment. Washington, however, has recently created a State Board for Community Colleges which will seek cooperation with the Board of Regents for each of the two universities and three state colleges. At present, the chief coordinating force is the Central Budget Agency. But it is difficult to predict whether coordination will go beyond this voluntary level.

The relationships between institutions of higher education most closely approaches anarchy in two Southern states. Alabama's Department of Education has started making preliminary plans to submit a proposal for comprehensive planning in the state. In 1959 the Alabama Education Commission recommended an Alabama Education Commission on Higher Education, with power to conduct research. The recommendation was never implemented.

At present, each of Alabama's three universities have their own boards of trustees. Six of the state colleges operate under the State Board of Education but a seventh has its own board. The State Board of Education controls junior colleges. But there is very little relationship between any of these.

The series of events that led to the creation of the University of South Alabama is illustrative of the confusion that prevails in the state. The University of Alabama had been reluctant to establish a full branch in the Mobile area, possibly on the ground that to do so would jeopardize enrollments on the parent campus. It also balked at suggestions that a new institution be created. But the people of Mobile were able to generate enough political influence to create a new institution with its own board and a mandate to become a comprehensive university. There is some evidence to suggest that a similarly uncoordinated effort will result in another new university in the Huntsville area.

Louisiana presents another scene of confusion. In 1964, the state had 14 public institutions. Seven more have been authorized. All are governed by two boards of trustees, although which board shall control which new institution is undefined. Ultimately, the Louisiana State University Board will control nine institutions of higher education and the State Board of Education will control 12. In 1966, an attempt to create a Board of Regents for all higher education received not a single favorable vote in the house committee of its origin.

Furthermore, a number of other state agencies play some part in the machinery of higher education, i.e., a Commission for Higher Education Facilities, a Louisiana Commission on Extension and Continuing Education and the Louisiana Higher Education Assistance Commission. Many attempts have been made to create some coordinating agency, but without success. All attempts to bring order into this jungle have failed. And there seems to be no deposition to create anything in the near future.[1]

It is difficult to understand why these particular states perpetuate such confusion, but several of the patterns do tempt speculation. Perhaps there is more affinity between the New England mind and the deep South mentality than residents of either area would care to admit. Lack of resources may be involved, although poor states elsewhere have accepted coordination in order to stretch limited resources. In any case, it is possible to predict that eventually, in some shape or other, some more formal system of coordination will be adopted.

---

[1] An excellent resume of the Louisiana situation is contained in Emogene Pliner's Coordination and Planning, Louisiana Higher Education Report No. 3, Baton Rouge, Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc., 1966.

# CHAPTER III

## Master Plans for Higher Education

A large majority of the United States have developed, are developing, or are conducting studies in anticipation of developing master plans for higher education. Some employ a group of studies or documents approximating a master plan. Only 12 states neither have a plan nor expect to create one. Generally, these plans or studies provide for various levels of higher education, although they may vary in the degree of specificity.

Typically, the master plan recommends a system of higher education consisting of two (Florida) or three elements (Pennsylvania) and then requests that the board for each segment plan specific details (Colorado). Most master plans or state studies are made by a commission or council on higher education (Colorado), an ad hoc committee (Michigan), or by the Board of Education (California) or one of its agencies, in response to legislative mandate. Recommendations are made to the legislature or governor for subsequent enactment into law.

Until legislation is passed, the recommendations exert no force, but some states use them as guide lines. California's master plan became operative with the Donohoe Act of 1960, but Arizona's master plan, developed by the state's three senior institutions, remains only a set of guide lines or principles. While master plans vary in specificity, those in existence typically provide for levels of higher education, some form of statewide coordination, some attention to modes of financing, and some procedures for review and revision. These last may range from a simple recommendation for review, to the New York requirement that each segment up-grade its master plan at stipulated intervals. Specific programs exhibit the same range. The Illinois, California, and Florida plans all called for the creation of definite institutions at specific locations. For the most part, this has been accomplished. Arizona and Oregon, on the other hand, are more general in their suggestions.

It is difficult to generalize about the factors that may favor master plan implementation. There is some indication that Southeast and Western states are more likely to implement master plans, but the examples of Ohio and Massachusetts call that generalization into question. Very wealthy or very poor states seem disposed toward master plan implementation but, again, a question is raised by the examples of Michigan and Alabama.

A complex of factors is more likely. Implementation is influenced by such things as the character of existing institutions' presidents, the rapidity of public higher education's expansion, the wealth of a state, the pressures of student demands, the actual individuals who made the plan's basic studies, and the political influence of a sponsoring agency's members. Barriers to a plan's full implementation are similarly complex, with the most significant factors being institutional fear of external control, legislative fear of increased costs and long-established traditions.

Clearly, provisions of implemented master plans are related to institutional plans. Prototypes in Illinois, California, Ohio and New York are always considered when institutions must make a major planning decision. And in states such as New Jersey or Pennsylvania, institutions are awaiting implementation so that they may perfect their own plans. Strangely enough, where states lack a master plan, institutional conduct seems conditioned so as to avoid one.

In general, individual state plans are not directly related to regional planning agencies. This is partly because agencies such as the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Southern Regional Education Board try to concern themselves with an entire region, and do not wish to seem preoccupied with just one state. When regional and state agencies coordinate plans, they do so chiefly through informal conversations, conferences, or workshops. Obviously state plans do recognize regional planning for high cost professional education, but even here the relationships are likely to lie between the regional body and state political authority.

The subjects of relationships and barriers to implementation, as viewed by the relevant office of statewide coordination, are indicated in Table IV below. In interpreting the table, it should be remembered that barriers may exist which the head of the coordinating agency did not wish to recognize.

Usually, statewide coordination does not actively involve private higher education. In states like California, Missouri

# TABLE IV

## STATES WITH A MASTER PLAN

| | Barriers to Implementation | | | | | | | Relation to Regional Plan | | Provision for Revision | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Time | Money | Institute Autonomy | Opposition Private Institution | Lack of Staff | Legislature In-action | No Serious Barriers | Yes | No | Yes | No | Revision On-going Process |
| Arizona | X | X | | | | | | | X | | | X |
| California | | | | | | | X | | X | X | | |
| Colorado | | | | | | | | | X | X | | |
| Florida | | | X | | | | | X | | | | X |
| Illinois | | | | X | | | | | X | | | X |
| Kentucky | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Massachusetts | X | X | | | X | | | | X | | X | |
| Mississippi | | | | | | X | | | X | | X | |
| Missouri | | | | | | | | | X | X | | |
| Montana | | | | | | | | | X | | | X |
| New Mexico | | | | | | | | | X | X | | |
| New York | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| Ohio | | | | | | | B | | | X | | |
| Oregon | | | | | | | | | X | | X | |
| Pennsylvania | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| Wisconsin | X | | | | | | | | X | X | | X |

P - Partially or in part
A - All parts implemented by law
B - There is a question concerning state aid to private institutions

and Pennsylvania, representatives of private institutions helped prepare master plans and play a role in subsequent coordination. But generally the private sector is unaffected by state master planning. This probably encourages cooperation and coordination within the private sector. It is true that most master plans explicitly recognize the contributions of private higher education, and express the wish that pluralism be preserved. At this writing, however, the safest generalization is that long range master planning for a state or region is chiefly an exercise for public higher education. Table V reflects this pattern and also indicates the present level of implementation.

Most state master plans are based on common assumptions. They are: An increased proportion of youth seeking higher education, a need for more highly trained manpower, greater state control over tax fund use, brought on by rising costs of higher education, state obligation to provide each person with maximum educational opportunity, and the idea that students will pay part of the cost of their education.

These assumptions have gradually evolved out of higher education studies dating back to the 1950's, when such documents as Ronald Thompson's Impending Tidal Wave of Students warned of the coming student enrollment explosion. Gradually, these studies matured into master plans or approximation of master plans. Thus, most plans assume future enrollment expansion, plus the idea that the

# TABLE V

## STATES WITH A MASTER PLAN

| | Level to Which Plan Applies | | | Adoption of Plan | | | | | Implementation | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | All Higher Education | All Public Institutions | Public 4 year Only | Law | Policy of Higher Education Institutions | Public Policy | Action Under Consideration | No Action | Being Implemented | No Action |
| Arizona | P | X | | | X | | | | X | |
| California | | X | | P | | | | | X | |
| Colorado | X | | | P | P | | | | X | |
| Florida | | X | | | | | | X | X | |
| Illinois | P | X | | P | P | P | | | X | |
| Kentucky | | X | | P | P | | | | X | |
| Massachusetts | | X | | X | | | | | A | |
| Mississippi | X | | | | | | | X | | X |
| Missouri | X | | | | | | X | | | X |
| Montana | | | X | | X | | | | X | |
| New Mexico | | | X | | | X | | | X | |
| New York | X | | | P | P | | | | X | |
| Ohio | X | | | | X | | | | X | |
| Oregon | X | | | | | | | X | | X |
| Pennsylvania | | X | | | | X | | | X | |
| Wisconsin | | X | | | | | X | | X | |

P - Partially or in part
A - All parts implemented by law
B - There is a question concerning state aid to private institutions

public sector will be required to absorb a majority of those who will attend colleges and universities.

In the light of these assumptions, all plans seek to provide complete geographical access to higher education. It is generally accepted that private higher education's capacity to expand is limited. Hence, the public sector must provide spaces for those students yet to come. Even in the Eastern states where private schools were traditionally epxected to educate a majority of college-age youth, this expectation is shifting. States such as Massachusetts, New York and Maryland thus plan to absorb the bulk of the increased enrollment in public institutions.

A few states wish to help private institutions increase capacity so they can maintain a reasonable ratio to the public enrollments. California, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Ohio are examples. But the majority see most students accommodated in a two- or three-segment system, with the three-segment system being the most common. Most plans call for one or more state universities to concentrate on upper division and graduate and professional education, and to emphasize major research. Middle-level professional training, especially teacher preparation, is expected to be the province of state colleges. Junior colleges or two-year branch campuses (Ohio, Pennsylvania and Indiana) are planned to take all those not qualified for either type of four-year institution.

Most plans seem based on estimates of population growth and general economic tendencies provided by state or university forecasting offices. These are usually juxtaposed with certain national norms, while some index of economic and population ranking justifies an expanded system of higher education. If the state ranks fourth in per capita income and population and only tenth in production of doctorates, the arguement is then advanced that the state should increase its graduate effort.

Typically, enrollment projections are based on the birth rate, modified by historical trends in school attendance and increased by a factor of one to two per cent a year. However, the Carnegie studies on the future of higher education are beginning to suggest that there may be a drop in enrollments after 1980, unless new groups within the population are attracted to higher education. Nor have any master plans seriously mentioned the possibility that college attendance may not be the only means of meeting the needs of college age youth. Nevertheless, belief in a greatly expanded higher education enterprise prevails.

It has been noted that while master plans recognize private higher education, specific provisions typically pertain to the public sector. Within that sector, plan subjects vary. Finance for physical facilities is usually considered. So are the broad problems of statewide coordination and institutional governance. Beyond the usual plea for more or better prepared teachers, the duties and responsibilities of faculties are not specified. Student aid, including the need for more scholarship and loan funds, is generally mentioned and some plans deal with the techniques of obtaining it. Allocation of broad curricular programs to individual institutions, and some technique for new program review comprises a part of most master plans. Except in statewide plans created by individual institutions, greater specificity about the curriculum is lacking.

The relationship of state to other master plans varies from state to state. The Regents' plan is basic to the system-wide plans of the State and City Universities of New York. The California state college system and the University of California also plan within guide lines established by the Coordinating Council. In Florida, the role and scope studies of individual institutions are expected to conform to system-wide needs. But in Missouri and Wisconsin, where coordinating agencies expect to influence institutional plans, there is evidence that they do not.

Clearly, the intent of most master planning is to encourage coordination between and among systems, as well as among individual institutions. And there is evidence that it does. For example, the chief of Colorado's junior college system tries to coordinate his work with that of the commission. There are, however, cases like Michigan's, where efforts at coordination have had the opposite effect.

State master plans most frequently recommend the creation of new junior colleges, expansion of existing four-year institutions and creation of new institutions in populated areas where no public institution exists. With only a few exceptions, state master plans are not concerned with details, such as prescribing small experimental colleges on existing campuses, although there is nothing in the plans to prevent it.

The amount of detailed statistical data accumulated as a basis or a result of state master plans ranges from the multi-volume reports prepared in California, New York, and Illinois, to that of Arizona, which is almost non-existent. Data is presented in forms peculiar to each state, precluding significant compilation for a nation or region. Several of the regional compacts have attempted to provide basic data (the Southern Regional Education Board is a notable example), but eventually there will be a wealth of information. Every master plan carries the provision that further studies (projections) should be made.

Just as the states exhibit considerable diversity among higher education coordination and control systems, so do they differ as to the degree of long range master planning. Although pure categories are almost impossible to establish, a gross classification does make possible some analysis by type.

Sixteen states have completed master plans or developed studies which approximate master plans. And while many provisions have not been implemented, enough have so that some documents can be described as public policy.

Nine states have completed studies of their higher education missions, and these studies are viewed as necessary preludes to master plans, but most of the recommendations have not been enacted.

Thirteen states are creating master plans. In a sense, this is the least satisfactory category because it conceals a wide variation in the degree of planning achievement. North Carolina is well along with the necessary background studies, but South Carolina is just getting started. Michigan is listed as developing a master plan although it has long made only statewide surveys.

The last category consists of 12 states which have no master plan and do not intend to develop one. But this, too, is an oversimplification, because Georgia, which has no formal plan but benefits from an entire university system's long range planning, falls into this group. It is almost a distortion to categorize Georgia with Indiana, which rejects planning almost as a matter of public policy. Table III of the appendix indicates the degree of planning progress achieved by each state.

State characteristics influencing master plan completion vary widely. California, New York and Illinois (all large, wealthy states) have completed plans, but so has Mississippi. Pennsylvania and Ohio are well along the road toward master plans, but so are Colorado and New Mexico. Perhaps the plains states, such as Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska, are reluctant to involve themselves in master planning, but then both Dakotas intend to create master plans. Of the North Central states, Indiana has no master plan, while Ohio, which borders it, has an accepted master plan and a new, but well-developed system of coordination and control. Four states which showed above average population increases between 1960 and 1966 have plans but others below the national average also have them. Thus, to provide the clearest possible picture of the status of statewide planning for higher education, the discussion will focus on each of several categories.

## Completed or Partially Completed Master Plans

State master plans are of relatively recent vintage. California's was completed in 1960, Illinois' in 1964, New York's in 1964, Ohio's and Missouri's in 1966, and Mississippi's in 1966.

The first New York master plan was developed by the Board of Regents. Subsequent versions were developed by sectors of higher education within the state, i.e., SUNY, CUNY. The Missouri, Ohio and Illinois plans were prepared by legislatively-established coordinating agencies, while the California plan was created by an ad hoc committee representing all segments of higher education in the state. All plans, however, were made with the advice of groups representing many sectors of the society. In some instances, representatives of those groups testified before hearings concerning a proposed master plan. Generally the working committees, e.g., admissions, financial affairs, etc., were composed of representatives from institutions; a logical move in view of the specialized nature of their tasks. But most states used laymen as members of overall advisory committees. It is difficult to ascertain how representative these laymen are, because their titles and affiliations are not usually indicated in the master plan document itself. But in all cases, private institutions seem reasonably represented on the general advisory committees and on the specialized task forces. Table VI indicates the agency responsible for each plan, and date of publication.

A list of all the people who served on state master plan committees would be burdensome and not especially profitable. But the committees in Missouri and Illinois suggest a typical pattern.

The Missouri Commission on Higher Education is composed of representatives from public and private higher education as well as laymen. The state's General Advisory Committee consists of board members and chief administrative officers from a number of public and private institutions in Missouri. The Special Advisory Committees for phsyical facilities, financial affairs, collegiate talent search, continuing education, graduate education and admission and retention policies are composed of relevant professionals from public and private institutions in the state.

Illinois made use of Citizens', Faculty and Presidents' Advisory Committees. These were aided by task committees on college enrollments, admission and retention of students, faculty study, collegiate programs, research, two-year colleges, extension and public service, vocational, technical and adult education, physical facilities, and finance, each composed of relevant professionals.

## TABLE VI

## AGENCIES PREPARING STATE MASTER PLANS OR THEIR EQUIVALENT AND DATE OF PREPARATION

| State | Agency | Date of Publication |
|---|---|---|
| Arizona | Board of Regents | 1966 |
| California | State Department of Education and Board of Regents | 1960 |
| Colorado | Commission on Higher Education | 1967 |
| Florida | Authorized by Legislature | 1956 & 1967 |
| Illinois | Board of Higher Education | 1964 |
| Kentucky | Commission on Higher Education | 1966 |
| Massachusetts | Board of Higher Education | 1965 |
| Mississippi | Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning | 1966 |
| Missouri | Commission on Higher Education | 1966 |
| Montana | Regents of the University of Montana | 1963 |
| New Mexico | Commission appointed by Board of Education Finance | 1964 |
| New York | Board of Regents | 1964 |
| Ohio | Ohio State Board of Regents | 1966 |
| Oregon | Educational Coordinating Council | 1966 |
| Pennsylvania | State Board of Education | 1967 |
| Wisconsin | Coordinating Committee on Higher Education | 1967 |

## Specific Provisions of Master Plans

Some gross comparisons of all master plan provisions are possible. Presented in Table VII of the appendix, these figures reveal that state master plans deal with much the same issues and in somewhat typical fashion.

Two samples, briefly compared, show the sorts of provisions actually found in these master plans. The first group consists of five master plans which may be regarded as reasonably complete attempts. These are California, Missouri, Ohio, and Illinois, and New York.

All provide for differentiation of function according to institution type, although Missouri and Ohio are much less precise than the other three states.

All provide for some form of coordination, but the coordinating agencies of Illinois and California are most similar.

All assume that students of differing academic abilities will attend different sorts of institutions, but there is little agreement on how this will be accomplished. California emphasizes restrictive enrollment while Ohio relies on counseling.

Only California advocates free tuition as a matter of public policy.

All except Missouri advocate, explicitly or implicitly, a higher educational facility within commuting distance of every student in the state.

There is little agreement as to whether institutions are expected to evolve or are prohibited from doing so. California is, of course, the most restrictive on this score and Ohio seems the most permissive.

There seems to be no basic differences between the provisions of the more fully implemented master plans and those which are evolving. There are, of course, differences in detail. Some states follow the California model, with its system of state university, state colleges and junior colleges. Others follow a branch campus rationale. But evolving plans in New Mexico, Colorado and Pennsylvania all reflect current trends in statewide planning.

The 10-year New Mexico plan assumes a doubling of college enrollment between 1961 and 1975. It further assumes that the state can afford the cost and expects education to deploy its resources wisely. The plan was developed by a commission consisting of a board member from each of the seven public institutions in the state and others appointed by the Board of Educational Finance. Professional services were supplied by the institutions themselves.

The programs to be offered by the seven public institutions would be determined by need. Programs in existence at the time of the plan would be maintained, but mechanisms would be provided for phasing out unneeded ones. Institutions would use a student-faculty ratio of 25 to 1 in determining whether or not to embark on new programs. While each institution would offer basic liberal or general education through the first two years of college work, it would seek to avoid or even eliminate duplication of upper level programs, or would share with other institutions the cost of offering needed specialized programs at several places. Doctoral work would be limited to those institutions which have at least 10 faculty members in a department. While other institutions may ultimately become comprehensive universities, for the moment the University of New Mexico would be the only one offering degrees at all levels.

Pressures for admission to the state's institutions are not likely to be great enough to necessitate high selectivity. Therefore the customary "C" average in high school would suffice as a criterion for admissions. Out-of-state student tuitions would be increased to levels comparable to those charged by states with which New Mexico exchanges students. In-state students would be charged tuition, but rates would be equalized among institutions.

Staffing of New Mexico institutions is recognized as a serious problem. The system would try to move toward its goal of a 25 to 1 student-teacher ratio by exploiting such things as new media and new instructional techniques, and by limiting the proliferation of curricula. Positive faculty recruitment would be undertaken by improving salaries, fringe benefits and opportunities for research.

The planning for and utilization of physical plant facilities needs improvement. In the future, space utilization studies would be made, and long range plans developed on the basis of better utilization. Each institution would establish a list of facilities priorities which will then be consolidated by the Board of Educational Finance. All state institutions would develop a uniform cost analysis of college housing.

Recognizing the limitations of state resources, the master plan calls on institutions for economy of operation, for tuitions to bear an important share of the cost of education and for better management procedures.

The existing structure of higher education in New Mexico is judged adequate and should be continued. This leaves control to the boards of the several institutions, but continues the power of the Board of Educational Finance and of course leaves the determination of budgetary priorities to the legislature.

Two years after New Mexico developed its plan, Colorado created one based on the assumption that statewide planning and coordination are necessary to make educational opportunity widely available.

Perhaps the major element in the Colorado plan is its emphasis on a statewide system which would prevent the proliferation of colleges or the expansion of institutions into new types with new missions simply because of political pressures. Local creation and support of two-year colleges made the problem particularly pronounced. Thus a major burden of this blueprint was to bring order into that sector of higher education.

Both New Mexico and Colorado recognize the geographic realities. They accept responsibility for making higher education available to all qualified people. Their plans show a conviction that proliferation of expensive courses and programs should be limited. The planners obviously believe in coordination, especially at the level where budgets may be influenced. They adhere to the principle of distributing functions by type of institution. And they subscribe to the doctrine that students should, when at all possible, bear part of the cost of education. The essential differences between the two are Colorado's emphasis on community colleges and the more conservative economic and social tone that pervades the New Mexico plan.

Pennsylvania's Master Plan for Higher Education was issued in January, 1967. Prepared by the State Board of Education, this document is intended to provide a framework for immediate policy decisions, but to be sufficiently flexible so that review and revision is possible. Its objective is to allow each Pennsylvanian access to a relevant institution of higher education.

The envisioned system is to consist of such commonwealth institutions as Pennsylvania State University, the University of Pittsburgh and Temple University. Pennsylvania's 13 state colleges comprise the second segment and the community colleges the third. No branch campuses are to be established in the future. These segments would be governed by a State College Board of Trustees, replacing individual college boards: a Community College Coordinating Council incorporating representatives from each institution, and a University Coordinating Council seating representatives from each of the three universities. A Council of Higher Education would coordinate the entire system through the office of a Commissioner for Higher Education.

Currently, students in all segments pay tuition, but the plan anticipates the possibility of free tuition. The plan asks the state to increase its support of higher education markedly and to designate appropriations as "preferred." Its plan recommends state support of private institutions involved in doctoral or medical education, but all previously existing programs of state support for private institutions would be frozen at present levels and eventually phased out. However, provisions are made for a Commonwealth Capital Assistance Fund to help private institutions create new facilities. The plan urges that the present state scholarship and guaranteed loan programs be increased.

To recapitulate:

Most master plans are legislatively authorized and funded. They either recommend creation of or come as a result of some statewide coordinating and planning agency.

Most master plans are developed by educators, aided by considerable advice from lay segments of the states' population.

Master plans usually recognize the values of private higher education, but only a few make specific recommendations that will help those institutions financially. Cooperation between the public and private sectors is urged but rarely mandated.

Master plans typically recognize the need for different types of institutions, and make provision for specific role and scope delineations. But plans differ in the latitude given institutions to change missions. Thus California prohibits state colleges from offering doctoral work, Colorado discourages it, and Ohio accepts it as inevitable.

All master plans accept the need to provide for commuting students, but differ as to whether separate two-year colleges, or branches of four-year institutions should be the principal device.

All of the states using master plans assume a rapid increase in college enrollments and accept their responsibility to provide educational opportunity for all qualified students. Projection formulae differ, however, and data cannot be combined into any meaningful aggregate projection.

All master plans assume that the college-age and college-attending populations will increase more rapidly than the population as a whole.

Every state assumes that the labor force would need many more professionally or technically-trained workers in the future, and that the state is obliged to train many of them.

Maximum institution size may or may not be specified in state master plans. California and Florida pose the most rigid specifications.

Master plans typically call for the creation or expansion of institutions in the most densely-populated regions of their states.

However, only New York makes explicit provisions for higher education in the central city.

State master plans generally recognize the need for tuition. Only California and the sub-plan for the City of New York advocate tuition-free education.

Master plans differ on the subject of selectivity. Again, California is most rigid on this subject and Ohio is the least.

Master plans are also inconsistent in the matter of out-of-state students. New Mexico and California apparently discourage them through higher fees. The other master plans are silent on the subject.

All master plans accept higher education as a major responsibility of state government.

All master plans assume that careful planning and coordination will make greater use of the educational dollar. But state plans differ in their degree of preoccupation with economies. New Mexico's plan seems rooted in economics, while California's seems to be more concerned with providing needed educational services.

Accepting the fact that a composite picture will not truly represent any of its prototypes, nonetheless it may be instructive to outline a model state system of higher education.

There will be a coordinating agency, composed of members representative of the state at large and appointed by the governor. This board will be responsible for making long range studies of higher education, for suggesting institutional role and scope, and for reviewing institutional budgets.

The coordinating council maintains a professional staff, headed by a person presumed qualified for high administrative post. This staff develops studies, makes recommendations, and probably seeks to enlarge its sphere of influence in states higher education.

From the coordinating council depend the boards for the state university, the state colleges as a group and the junior colleges. These boards control and operate their separate institutions.

The state university is expected to provide education in the arts and sciences, graduate education and research, and preparation for the higher professions. In addition to a general or liberal education, the state colleges offer teacher preparation, business and engineering. In general, they restrict their degrees to the bachelor's and master's level.

The branch campus, or junior college, is supposed to be the basic unit in each state's scheme for higher education. It offers general, technical-vocational and some form of adult education. These institutions are intended as open-door commuter colleges. Their enrollment increases are expected to be larger than for other sectors in the state system.

Tuition is to be charged at all levels but the state bears a heavy share of all building and operating costs. In return, the state expects to exercise considerable influence or control.

## Master Plans Being Developed

Master plans are under development, mandated or clearly projected by coordinating agencies in 15 states, i.e., Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont and Virginia. These states cannot be characterized by wealth, legislated control over higher education, or previous statewide concern for and study of higher education.

Mississippi and Oklahoma exert centralized control over four-year institutions, while Michigan and Minnesota's constitutional universities presumably could reject legislated control if they saw fit. Michigan and New Jersey represent one level of state wealth, while Mississippi and South Carolina exemplify another. Vermont and Texas represent interesting contrasts in size, and Idaho and Florida illustrate antithetical locations. Michigan and New Jersey have long conducted studies of higher education, while such state inquiries are a recent innovation in North Carolina.

Indeed, casual scrutiny of this 15-state group suggests that it is representative of the entire nation, with this single exception: No Pacific Coast state is represented.

Since these states' master plans are still being developed, they obviously cannot be described nor analyzed. But by examining the situation and available progress reports, some reasonable estimates are possible.

Minnesota's system includes one large comprehensive university, state colleges and an expanding system of junior colleges, plus a substantial number of private liberal arts colleges. Perhaps the only variation that a master plan might urge, would be that several state colleges be allowed to enter doctoral work on a limited basis. A study committee is actually at work on such a proposition. A master plan may help in reassignment of roles in New Jersey. Rutgers would welcome some guide lines for itself and the state teachers colleges. Thus we might pose the hypothesis that this group's master plans, when developed, will maintain the status quo, and that specific details will be consistent with it. Interim reports from North Carolina, Texas, South Carolina and Mississippi support such an hypothesis.

## Individual or Groups of Institutions Doing Master Planning

In many states, existing councils, commissions or ad hoc groups have developed master plans. In others, where explicit attention has been given to long range planning, one or several institutions are responsible for all higher education. As they plot their own futures, these institutions are in effect planning for the entire state. While there are some differences, Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii and Rhode Island seem to fit this style of master planning. In some respects Arizona fits this category, although it also resembles states having master plans. The Arizona Board of Regents controls the three state universities and maintains an organic connection with the state Junior College Board.

In general, the long range master plans in these states have been developed somewhat differently from those in states using coordinating agencies. The University of Hawaii has made use of outside consultants to do specific data gathering but has then relied on faculty committees for actual projection and policy recommendation. In Rhode Island much of the long range planning seems concentrated in its two institutional administrations, although the University of Rhode Island has used its Office of Institutional Research as a prime data-gathering facility.

In 1963, the University of Delaware published an extended forecast of students, staff, and facilities for the 15 years ending in 1977. This document does not identify the particular persons who conducted the various studies, but it appears to be a product of the university's central administration, which relies for specialized inquiries on various professionals within the faculty.

The long range plan for Arizona was made for the Board of Regents by its staff, with specialized reports emanating from faculty of the three institutions. Kansas' Board of Regents invited an outside panel to make a study of the state's higher education and to recommend a consistent master plan. The University of Alaska seems to have employed outside consultants to gather specific facts for its own faculty, which focused its attention on a self-study. A central administration's suggestions and recommendations were also considered.

Generally, long range master plans made by institutions bearing statewide responsibilities, plot programming and even courses in greater detail than do presidential or regental master plans, or master plans made by outside agencies. In effect, institutional master plans are operational statements on which institutions propose to take action, while the regental plans reflect broad policy statements.

## States Without Master Plans

Ten states or districts indicate that they have no master plan and anticipate none. Alabama, Louisiana, Indiana, New Hampshire, Nebraska, Wyoming, Washington, Connecticut, Iowa and the District of Columbia all seem unlikely, for a wide variety of reasons, to produce master plans.

As with the group of states presently developing master plans, states that have rejected master planning exhibit no discernible pattern. Two Southern states, two New England states, three North Central or Plains states, and two Mountain or Pacific Coast states comprise the group. Some have rejected planning because they seem to do well without it, and others are too disorganized to consider any move toward it. Wealthy Connecticut is juxtaposed with the less favored Wyoming. Some educational historian of the future might attempt to analyze this peculiar cluster of states and the stance they have taken regarding coordination and master planning.

## Evaluation of Master Plans

At this writing, it is impossible to judge the long term effectiveness of master plans or to indicate which sorts of recommendations are appropriate for which states. Typically, master plans have been initiated through political desire for greater efficiency in higher education, social desire to extend its opportunities, and economic desire to produce the skilled workers needed for a technological society. It is difficult to say whether master plans have in fact facilitated this. Indiana and Illinois have populations of about the same educational attainment, but one has an elaborate master plan and the other has none. Michigan has no master plan and California has a complex one, but both have distinguished systems of higher educatio universities of the highest quality.

But some assessment can be made of the plans themselves. Robert Berdahl suggests that most master plans have been overdetailed or superficial attempts to achieve short range objectives, i.e., accommodation of many students or the achievement of efficiencies. He believes that plans should focus on long-term state educational goals, including the assessment of options for achieving those goals.[1] If his criteria are valid, it is true that master plans and state studies are short-range efforts to achieve educational goals by orthodox or traditional means. All accept the enlargement of educational opportunity as a valid goal which can generally best be achieved through existing forms of institutions--for the most part public. No plan probes the possibility that business, labor unions, or the military could make important substantive contributions to meeting educational needs, although all are, in fact, doing so now.

---

[1] Robert Berdahl, Master Planning in Higher Education, unpublished, paper given at the State University of New York, October 20, 1967.

Similarly, plans seem to codify popular attitudes rather than seeking to transcend them. The need for more graduate education and more research is accepted. So is the premise that a state's educational attainment and economic viability are interrelated. The assumption that varying student abilities require various types of institutions is accepted and recommendations for a complex system based on that premise. Yet, it is possible to conceive of regional, comprehensive institutions which could contain university, state college and junior college functions. Boston University and the University of Minnesota have long demonstrated the feasibility of such a plan.

The need for pluralism in higher education is also assumed, and on the basis of that assumption, private institutions are encouraged. Yet, neither the assumption nor the means for achieving pluralism are examined. Technical and vocational education are valued especially in the two-year branch campus or junior college. Yet, no one questions whether the society is actually using most of the products of such programs.

It is claimed that master plans are an effective device for communicating with the society at large about the nature and needs of education. If this is so, the public must have an amazing tolerance for arid prose, over-generalization and indigestible statistics. Few master plans are written in a way that could excite the public, or for that matter, the professionals in education and government. Perhaps this is because they all partake of the quality of government documents which should probably retain a certain neutrality of tone. But if education is as crucial as the plans claim it to be, one can hope for a little more drama.

In spite of these criticisms, however, master plans seem to reflect a real desire on the part of both education and government to attempt, through rational means, to make education an effective instrument of policy. The art of such planning is relatively new and awkwardness is to be expected. As techniques are refined and as studies are completed, improvements can be expected.

# CHAPTER IV

## Voluntary Coordination and Long Range Planning

Regional planning groups have emerged in response to a variety of needs. Regional accrediting agencies are aimed at standardizing the services of higher education, regional compacts responded to a need for highly trained manpower, regional consortia arose from the need to enrich programs and effect economies of operation, and regional associations of research universities try to make more effective use of Federally-supported and other regional research installations. All set their objectives and priorities in the context of their own traditions, and none seem inclined to involve themselves in other than higher education.

Accrediting agencies make no substantive distinction between public and private higher education. Neither do the regional compacts, although they are quasi-governmental in character. Quite clearly, the regional consortia of private institutions put the interests of members first although they do not reject cooperation with the public sector. Most regional associations of universities make no distinction between education levels, although they are obviously chiefly interested in graduate education and research.

The amount of authority exerted by a regional association over individual institutions varies, but they usually rely on influence rather than authority. Regional accrediting associations are voluntary. They wield some legal power, however, because some education codes require teachers to be graduates of regionally accredited institutions. Several consortia have acquired authority over admissions standards and fee structures, but this power is always subject to recall by individually incorporated institutions. Regional compacts have the power to enter into agreements with individual institutions and with states, but apparently cannot insist upon such agreements. Except for broad regional policy statements, regional agencies do not appear to have developed regional plans for higher education. Planning seems much more likely to emerge as a result of ad hoc consideration of separate problems or projects.

Individual institutions plan in a context of regional affairs, but direct relationships do not always exist between institutions and regional groups. Cooperation and coordination thus fit the type of association and problem. A regional accrediting association will send a consultant to an institution planning new programs. Consortium presidents will meet periodically to develop policy, which then allows the executive head to work with appropriate officers of individual institutions. Most associations maintain professional staffs which work out the details of coordination. Such staffs are usually _ad hoc_ and quite individualistic in character.

Those directly involved in regional efforts appear satisfied with accomplishments within their particular spheres of operation. Some heads of private consortia would like to effect greater uniformity of operation among member institutions. But they also see that arrangements involving institutional autonomy require time, because they are foreign to the American tradition. Their major problems are predictable: lack of funds to mount needed programs, lack of qualified people and an abundance of institutional independence.

Regional consortia of private institutions seem to experience difficulty in institutionalizing their roles, and the National Commission on Accrediting has had similar problems. But since most have been circumspect in attempting their missions, difficulties have not been overpowering. Achievements have included the expansion of medical education through regional compacts, improvement of weak institutions through regional accrediting associations, curbing of specialized accrediting through efforts of national accrediting agencies, enrichment of undergraduate programs by regional consortia, and better utilization of research facilities through regional university associations.

It appears that regional cooperation can only increase in amount and quality. The various regional groups are seen as one way of establishing and implementing national policy without giving the Federal government a preeminent role. The Council of the States was clearly created with such a role in mind. The other agencies seemed equally conscious of the need for national policy, but aware of the dangers of over-centralization. We cannot certainly predict whether or not regional groups will develop comprehensive long range plans, but it seems doubtful that they will.

The American system of higher education is really not a system. Still, it functions and has functioned in a surprisingly uniform way. While we have no ministry of education, broad national policy exists and has dimensions which are accepted and acted upon by individual institutions, and even by states. Recently, of course, the Federal government, through such agencies as the United States Office of Education, the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, has become involved in the development of national policy and in efforts to accomplish long range planning. But even before Federal agencies and legislation became heavily involved in policy formation, policy was established and some long range planning accomplished.

In general, national and regional higher education policy is established through the interlocking system of voluntary organizations and associations whose leaders are in frequent contact with each other and whose publications form a common professional literature.

Groups such as the Association of American Colleges, the Land-Grant College Association and the spokesman for most of these, the American Council on Education, represent various types of institutions. Other organizations represent individuals. The largest of these are the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Association of University Professors, the American Association for Higher Education and the National Council of Teachers of English.

Several associations like the National Education Association or the American Association of Junior Colleges seek to reflect both individual and organizational or institutional concerns. To these should be added the regional accrediting agencies, the specialized accrediting agencies and the two national forums for accreditation, the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education and the National Commission on Accrediting. Then there are the three regional compacts, Southern New England and Western, the recently established Council of the States, and a growing number of cooperative arrangements between individual institutions, generally within a state or region.

Of a somewhat different order, but still significant in this complex of policy and long range planning organizations, we find the para-educational groups, such as the Educational Testing Service, the College Entrance Examination Board and the American College Testing Program. Furthermore, the major philanthropic foundations always influence policy formation and planning, whether they do it by supporting the programs of national associations (Ford--The American Council on Education, Kettering--American Association for Higher Education, Kellogg--American Association of Junior Colleges) or by mounting studies or conferences of their own (Danforth--Liberal Arts Education, Carnegie--Long Range Planning).

Interlocking memberships enable these organizations to keep abreast of each others' activities. Their discussions and conferences gradually establish broad policy. For example, a past president of the American Association for Higher Education was simultaneously vice chairman of the American Council on Education, chairman of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, chairman of the Test Development Committee of the Educational Testing Service, consultant to the Southern Regional Education Board and member of the task force to plan the International Conference on Education. Another person was simultaneously commission member for the American Association of Junior Colleges, board member of the College Entrance Examination Board, commission member of the American Council on Education, consultant to the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education and consultant for several state coordinating agencies. Still another person serves on the executive committee of the North Central Association, executive committee of the American Association for Higher Education, the research committee of the College Entrance Examination Board, the board for the American College Testing Program and his state coordinating council for higher education.

Frequently these organizations develop policy statements or initiate programs which codify common beliefs which in turn become quasi-official statements to which large segments of the higher education profession subscribe. For example, the Educational Policies Commission published _Equality of Educational Opportunity_, a policy statement which is generally cited as one justification for an elaborate state system of junior colleges or branch campuses.

The American Association of University Professors developed a technique for reporting institutional salaries which has helped increase faculty salaries throughout the country. More recently the American Council on Education has focused attention on the preparation of administrators through conference proceedings, work shops, and an internship program. And the American Academy of Arts and Sciences has focused on problems of the future through issues of its journal *Daedalus*.

The specific efforts of voluntary associations to engage in cooperative effort and long range planning should be viewed in this context. The regional and specialized accrediting associations are among the older, and in many ways the more significant of the voluntary organizations. They represent the American attempt to provide for a standardized system of education in the absence of any national, political agency. They were created to facilitate exchange of credits among institutions, provide governments with definitions of institutions of higher education and provide quality estimates to help philanthropic foundations in properly distributing resources.

There are six regional associations. Each of them attempts to assess its members' total institutional quality, thereby assuring some regional standardization of practice. Since this is their chief purpose, they tend to affect long range planning and coordination somewhat indirectly. Usually, they help institutions plan by consulting with them as new programs are developed, and through a process of new programs accreditation. Regional associations give initial assistance only if the institutions request it and several associations seek to emphasize the chief responsibility; that of setting and maintaining standards.

The North Central Association is illustrative, although perhaps more involved in institutional planning than other associations. It aids institutions by providing consultants to "developing institutions working toward accreditation, institutions planning new programs, particularly at higher degree levels, and institutions already accredited, but requiring assistance in finding solutions to problems of curriculum, finance, administration, library, faculty, etc."[1]

Although regional associations try to keep abreast of coordination and planning developments in other organizations, they usually have no formal arrangement for doing so. Several associations share materials with state departments of education. The Western College Association, for example, uses the same Guide for the Evaluation of Colleges and Universities as does the California State Board of Education, and several others make a deliberate effort to include other associations' representatives at annual meetings.

While representatives of accrediting agencies anticipate involvement in the growing complexity of higher education, that involvement will probably be an extension of their traditional roles.

Specialized, professional accrediting associations function similarly to regional associations, and are involved in long range planning to about the same degree. In order to protect institutions from too many association requirements, several institutional groups formed the National Commission on Accrediting in 1950. In the past it has attempted to restrict the number of professional accrediting agencies and to suggest regulations for the conduct of those it recognizes. In the future, however, it anticipates a direct role in long range planning and coordination.

---

[1] Memorandum from Norman Burns, dated Oct. 30, 1967.

In 1966, a Commission task force recommended action involving protection of the public interest; a long range program for examining crucial accrediting problems and issues and communicating findings to the educational profession, appropriate governmental agencies, and the general public; improvement of communication with regional and professional associations and members of the academic community; increased effort to work closely with Federal agencies on financial outlays to higher education; continued effort to restrict the expansion of professional program accreditation and investigation, and action leading to the coordination of accrediting inspections and requests for data made to colleges and universities by various accrediting associations.[1]

The three regional compacts--the Southern Regional Education Board, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the New England Board of Higher Education--are more explicitly concerned with long range planning problems and coordination of educational effort. These are public agencies formed and supported by the states comprising each region, and are intended to increase educational opportunities, expand the supply of specialized manpower, help institutions and states to improve their educational effort and inform the public of the needs and potentialities of education. The Southern Regional Education Board, first of these to be formed, grew out of a conviction that the South had a new educational role which would require many adjustments of traditional attitudes and practices.

---

[1] The Role and Function of the National Commission on Accrediting, Washington, National Commission on Accrediting, 1966.

After World War II, the South finally committed itself to industrialization and urbanization, thus facing colleges and universities with a demand for more and better-prepared technological and professional manpower. Since the Southern states were relatively poor, they could meet these demands only by pooling resources. This led to the development of the concept of interstate cooperation.

The New England and Western compacts were created for similar but also some quite different reasons. In the West, the post-World War II period saw a rapid increase in overall population, although a few states lacked adequate population or economic bases to support certain kinds of higher education. And the West, as well as the South, faced chronic shortages of professional manpower, especially in the health fields. New England was comprised of states both densely and lightly populated, and both urbanized and rural, but the aggregate need for more professional manpower throughout the region could only be supplied through cooperative compacts.

These compacts consist of members elected or appointed by the several states. They conduct programs through full time professional staffs. Usually, both educators and political figures serve as board members, although the proportion varies. While there are some differences in program emphasis, the three compacts generally engage in similar activities. The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education effects interstate exchange of students in expensive professional fields, maintains continuing education programs, identifies needs for new programs, conducts regionwide research and stimulates inter-institutional cooperation. It stresses increased manpower in the health-related fields.

The New England Board of Higher Education also stresses medical manpower and the exchange of students between states. It is attempting to coordinate the region's junior college program and to develop such regional resources as computer and continuing education centers. The Southern Regional Education Board is in many respects the prototype compact. The Western and New England programs are bound to resemble it. Through its "memorandum of agreement" technique, it has arranged for the interstate exchange of students. It conducts research on a wide variety of educational matters, sponsors conferences, is a source of consultation for states or institutions, conducts workshops for governors and legislators, and increasingly operates a variety of continuing education programs.

All of these compacts are chiefly concerned with education, although their charters could support entry into a wide range of public service. For example, the Southern Regional Education Board, although it tries to improve the social and economic level of the region, does not attempt direct improvement of public services other than higher education. Instead, it approaches improved public services through research and training, assuming that service will improve as more is known about a subject and personnel become better trained. From time to time, the Board will enter into a specific service project, but only if such a step is needed before attempting research and training. While the Board does some research on its own and trains some people directly, its more frequent style of operation is to stimulate individual institutions to undertake the necessary programs.

Generally, cooperative arrangements between regional compacts and other cooperative or coordinating agencies is on an ad hoc basis or through overlapping membership, rather than through formal associational ties. The Western Commission, for example, maintains its headquarters in Boulder, Colorado, close to several state agencies and the Council of the States.

Rather than plan explicitly for a region, compacts will suggest procedures, and then help institutions or states to plan for themselves. Thus, the Southern Board conducts conferences and publishes monographs on long range planning in the hope that institutions will then be better prepared to plan for themselves.

Rather than mount too many direct educational efforts themselves, compacts try to induce regional universities to cosponsor programs with them. Thus, the Western Commission and the University of California at Berkeley sponsor a summer institute on higher education, and the Southern Board joins with the American Council on Education to conduct a program designed to upgrade department heads.

The setting of goals for institutions, states and regions is essential to long range planning and cooperation. Regional complexes have contributed substantially to this activity by creating committees and commissions and exposing the public to the potentials of higher education. An outstanding example of such activity is Within Our Reach, the report of The Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South, created by the Southern Regional Education Board. In an attempt to project regional higher education aims one to two decades into the future, the Commission identified and indicated implementation of five important goals for the South:

1. To provide every individual with opportunity for maximum development of his abilities.
2. To produce citizens responsive to the social, economic and political needs of their time.
3. To achieve excellence in teaching scholarship and research.
4. To accelerate the economic progress of the Southern region through education and research.

5. To guide the region in solving social problems created by population changes, racial differences, urbanization and technological growth.

When former Harvard President, James Conant, suggested a compact of the most populous Southern states, and former Governor Terry Sanford made the idea a reality, many thought that a new supra-planning and coordination agency had been created. However, it is just beginning to disseminate information which may help states to plan better.

In addition to these voluntary associations and quasi-governmental compacts, small numbers of individual institutions have joined to improve education effort, effect efficiencies or conduct research. While it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine how many of these consortia or cooperative arrangements exist or are being planned, Raymond Moore estimated in 1966 that there were more than 1300, and judged that the number was continuing to grow. Most of the 1300 were arrangements between two institutions, but 175 involved cooperation between five or more. Moore also classified the arrangements reported to him and has furnished examples to illustrate each (see Appendix, Table XI).[1]

The regional associations of liberal arts colleges, state associations of private institutions, or regional associations of universities for cooperative research efforts are more directly comparable to state systems of higher education than the cooperative ventures of Moore's listing. These are likely to affect long range institutional planning only indirectly. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, for example, provides only comparative data on member institutions, presumably to make planning more effective. Its greatest contribution is arranging to make programs at one institution available to students from all institutions.

---

[1] Raymond S. Moore, Advance Report on Nationwide Study of Interinstitutional Cooperation (unpublished MSS).

The Central States College Association, on the other hand, has tried to become involved in some planning and research activities. With a $50,000 Federal grant (USOE), it is conducting studies of student attitudes believed relevant to all member institutions. It also fosters cooperative curricular planning in an attempt to avoid expensive duplication of facilities, and seeks arrangements enabling graduate students and faculty from member institutions to do part of their work on a small college campus and part at a complex institution. The Central States College Association seems to have gone further than most in breaking institutional autonomy through free circulation of academic credits and a single admissions policy.

At present there are 20 state associations of private colleges and universities, which often function like regional organizations. But these are more likely to deal directly with state planning or coordinating agencies to make sure that decisions about public institutions do not adversely affect private institutions. The Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, for example, is represented on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and thus has a voice in long range planning.

These state associations have finally created a national organization to facilitate information exchange and to provide for a uniform voice on common problems. The effort of 18 states to revise their constitutions, possibly in the direction of providing more aid to private schools, is particularly interesting. The President of this Coordinating Committee of State Associations has accumulated information about state master plans and coordinating agencies and made it available to member associations. In addition, he has tabulated information about state associations of independent colleges and universities. These tabulations are reproduced in the appendix, Table XII.[1]

The cooperative arrangements between complex universities, such as the one involving the Western Conference universities and the University of Chicago, are of a different order. The Mid-America State Universities Association is a more recently-formed group of this kind. Its functions are described in the words of its executive director:

> The current membership is Colorado, Colorado State, Iowa State, Kansas, Kansas State, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma and Oklahoma State...The nine universities...are represented on the Council of Participating Institutions by the president, the graduate dean and a representative of organized research from each member university. The officers are chairman, vice chairman and secretary-treasurer. These officers together with three other elected members form the Executive Committee which acts in behalf of the Council in the interim between annual meetings...

---

[1] Robert J. Bernard, unpublished report.

The voluntary nature of the association in MASUA should be emphasized. The autonomy of each member university is maintained...

MASUA provides the setting and serves as a catalyst in the development of cooperative programs among member institutions...

The goals of MASUA may be stated as follows:

To provide educational opportunity of the highest quality through cooperation on a regional basis.

To prevent wasteful and unnecessary duplication in order to achieve a high degree of excellence in each university's programs.

To promote improvement of specialized facilities and programs.

To share scarce resources.

To promote cooperative arrangements whereby specialized or unique educational programs may be made available on a resident fee basis to students on a regional basis.

To promote cooperative use of unusual research facilities.

To promote cooperation in securing major research or educational facilities for the region...

Kansas does not have a dental school, Nebraska does not have a school of veterinary medicine and the University of Missouri does not have a curriculum in architecture...MASUA has assisted in the development of bilateral agreements to provide such professional training in states where it does not exist. Typical of this is the compact between Missouri and Kansas under which Missouri students may study architecture at Kansas institutions and Kansans can study dentistry at the University of Missouri. Other professional areas are included in the agreement. Participants are considered resident students for fee purposes...

Another MASUA program is the program in agricultural development in Colombia which is administered on behalf of MASUA by the University of Nebraska and financed by AID and the Ford and Kellogg foundations. The personnel in the program...are recruited from MASUA universities. These universities also provide training for Colombians who are studying here under the program.

> MASUA universities are now considering a Traveling Scholar Program similar to that in existence in the CIC. Under this program a doctoral candidate near the completion of his program of study who can benefit from a term at another MASUA university may study there without the complication of the transfer of his records and fees from one institution to another. He would remain registered at his home university while studying for a term at the host university.
>
> Areas in which major cooperative programs may develop are libraries and computers. Conferences of MASUA representatives from these areas have been conducted and thinking about cooperative programs has been initiated...
>
> Because of its nature and the goals it has set, MASUA will have both a direct and an indirect effort on institutional planning. Since its role is not administrative it will probably not undertake the development of a master plan or other design which would directly influence the growth and development of member universities...It is very doubtful if MASUA will ever attempt a comprehensive regional plan.
>
> As a working arrangement each member university has the responsibility for dealing with the agencies within its own state...It is assumed that questions of accreditation are between the individual university and the accrediting agency and hence MASUA would not enter into such questions...
>
> The experience of MASUA has underscored the principle that programs must arise from a clearly defined interest and need on one or more of the campuses and they must be carried out with participation by the member universities...[1]

There are several less formal arrangements among complex institutions. The graduate deans of the Ivy League universities, University of California at Berkeley, and Stanford, meet twice a year to discuss common problems and to develop common stands on future problems or, occasionally, on Federal policy. Recently, they attempted to develop a uniform position on the drafting of graduate students. But it is still too early to know what effect such arrangements may have. Their very existence, however, offers additional evidence of a general tendency toward cooperation.

---

[1] Letter from Paul M. Young, Executive Director, Oct. 31, 1967.

The United States Atomic Energy Commission has sparked a number of cooperative enterprises intended to facilitate research and training of scientists in the atomic field. The Argonne Universities, Associated Western Universities Inc., Associated Rocky Mountain Universities Inc., and Associated Midwest Universities are examples, and all follow somewhat the same program of activities. They provide for research efforts, faculty and student training programs at atomic energy or other scientific facilities, and for other research and training activities best handled by an inter-institutional agency. Because of the specialized nature of their cooperative activities, the groups have not been involved in institutional long range planning, except where schools plan to exploit the cooperative venture.

An important characteristic of American higher education, indeed of American life, is the tendency to develop associations and even associations of associations. As the number of consortia and cooperative arrangements between colleges have increased, a need for communication and discussion of common problems arose. The Kansas City Regional Council on Higher Education has initiated a newsletter called the Acquainter. It is intended to link consortia systematically throughout the country. At this writing, it lists 30 organizations or associations as a potential prime reading audience and apparently has hit a responsive chord.[1]

At this time it is almost impossible to discover how these various voluntary agencies relate to each other or to public systems of higher education. Certainly we can perceive no organic ties. But the impression remains that the memberships of both policy-making and executive elements of the organizations and associations overlap sufficiently to facilitate discussion of at least broad national policy. The American Council on Education brings the executive secretaries of Washington-based associations together every two weeks to discuss common problems. Many association executives hold offices concurrently in several different organizations. The resource people called upon to speak to workshops, seminars and conferences represent a limited number of individuals, generally acquainted with each other and articulate about current attitudes in higher education.

---

[1] Associated Christian Colleges of Oregon, Associated Colleges of Central Kansas, Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Associated Mid-Florida Colleges, Associated Midwest Universities, Association of Eastern North Carolina Colleges, Association for Graduate Education and Research in North Texas, Atlanta University Center, Central States College Association, Claremont Colleges, Inc., College Center of the Finger Lakes, Commission for Independent Colleges and Universities, Committee of Presidents of Ontario Universities, Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area, Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Five-College Cooperation, Great Lakes Colleges Association, Harrisburg Area Center of Higher Education, Higher Education Coordinating Council of St. Louis, Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, Mid-Appalachia College Council, Inc., Mid-Missouri Associated Colleges, Mississippi Valley College Association, Piedmont University Center of North Carolina, Inc., Texas Association for Developing Colleges, Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, University Center of Georgia, University Center of Nashville, University Center in Virginia.

The statement of goals for Southern education could serve for any other region, or for the entire nation. Although specific concerns of various groups differ one can infer the dimensions of a national policy for higher education from the programs and statements of voluntary associations.

# CHAPTER V

## INSTITUTIONAL LONG RANGE PLANNING

Individual institutions, as well as states and regions, are involved in long range planning. And their planning seems approximately as advanced or retarded as it is in more complex organizations. While various types of institutions exhibit different styles of long range planning, some general tendencies can be inferred from a number of complex institutions. These tendencies offer a picture of the institutions--some of them mature and well established--attempting to plan without real sophistication. Some institutions, in fulfilling requirements for institutional development grants, have prepared estimates for the future. But the institutions themselves doubted the validity of the projections.

Other institutions, chiefly at the instigation of state planning or coordinating agencies, have prepared long range academic plans with supportive projections of enrollment, faculty, financial and physical plant needs. But again, responsible administrators warn that these were not to be trusted because conditions, over which the institutions had no control, changed.

More typically, institutions may have no more than the next year's budget projections as the basic data for planning. Gross estimates are made of enrollment increases, but not by field or level. And the basis for the projections is equally gross. The University of South Alabama predicts increases each year of 800 students--this being the number for which physical facilities can be built. The University of Massachusetts estimates 1,500 new students each year--again based on the rapidity of construction. Private institutions can, of course, predict enrollment if they have had a favorable application picture, i.e., more applicants than spaces. An MIT, Princeton, or Rice can decide just how many students it wants and then enroll them. But tax-supported institutions can only make educated guesses which often prove wrong.

Institutions are willing to provide subjective data; the best estimates of responsible people about prospects for the future. But the harder sort of information is untrustworthy and should be used with extreme caution in planning.

Planning has reached a more advanced level than has the collection of solid data upon which projections could be based. While most institutions do not charge separate offices with introducing order into anticipation, a few do. Boston University's office of institutional research, responsible to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, has been involved in making a detailed study of the future. San Francisco State College employs a senior dean for academic planning. The University of Connecticut, whose president has long championed planning, maintains an office of institutional research charged with encouraging each college to plots its own future in detail. The president of the University of Minnesota employs several assistants whose sole duties are those of planning. The University of California at Irvine has created an office of planning, headed by an architect. He has been able to bring academic, fiscal and physical plant planning into reasonable harmony and is moving the institution toward a modified form of programmed budgeting. The president of the University of Hawaii organized the faculty to produce a well-reasoned academic plan. Michigan State University maintains one of the more elaborate offices of institutional research, and has given it key responsibility for long range planning. In the author's judgment, Vanderbilt, using a faculty approach, has created a balanced and realistic plan for the future.

The usual approach to long range planning is to ask institutional sub-units to indicate desired and realistic direction for growth. The central administration tries to keep these dreams within limits by pointing out the realities of funding, space limitations, and the like.

## Statewide Fiscal Planning

In general, state planning agencies are not credited with much influence. They are usually looked upon as too new or too bureaucratic or simply insensible to the problems of individual institutions. A few institutions, e.g., the University of Missouri at Kansas City and Michigan State University, feel that stronger statewide planning would help them. Private institutions typically claim to be virtually unaffected by state planning groups. However, the developing private universities consider themselves in competition with the growing tax-supported institutions.

Precise long range planning must probably await the development of better cost accounting procedures and budgetary control techniques. Neither seems to have progressed much beyond the level suggested by the American Council on Education's books on business management and budget control. But a few groups have begun to experiment. The Florida institutions have been forced into a cost accounting process and appropriations are based on formula. The University of Massachusetts has developed a staffing formula based on cost analyses. The University of California hopes to adopt some form of programmed budgeting within five years. The University of Kentucky has also developed new approaches to cost accounting. But aside from these somewhat isolated examples, the relating of budget to performance is still a primitive art. One business manager still works out his projections by hand in schoolboy-type notebooks. Another vice president for finance said, "If you will tell me what a student is, I'll tell you what it costs to educate him."

Although such a summary paints a rather bleak picture of institutional long range planning, there is a great deal of interest in improving practice. Stanford University was one of the earliest private institutions to attempt long range fiscal and program planning. In 1958 and 1959, its president, his chief advisers, and the Board of Trustees became aware of the need for a broader framework within which to account for the rising level of expenditures. The president was in fact caught between faculty and student demands for increased growth rates, which means increased expenditure, and the reservations of trustees, who felt that the institution was moving too rapidly. To obtain some impression of the rates and sizes of future expenditures, the president asked for a 10-year forecast for the whole institution, rather than a department-by-department analysis.

The Vice President for Finance made the initial forecast of anticipated needs and resources, and outlined the reasons for his estimates. The other chief officers of the central administration, and finally the Board of Trustees, reviewed these. It was agreed that the university, if it were to achieve its potential, would have to increase the level of support by something over $150,000,000 during the next 10-year period.

Fortuitously, Stanford's first long range plan was completed just as the Ford Foundation began to express an interest in making large general purpose grants to selected institutions. The Foundation gave a 3 to 1 matching grant of $25 million. This sparked more refined forecasts--one of minimal development, one of maximum, and one somewhere in between. The latter was finally accepted as a base for action. From this 10-year plan the administration selected high priority items to serve as the focus for a drive to secure an immediate $100,000,000. At the same time, plans were drawn to gain the additional $150,000,000 which the long range plan indicated as essential.

Once the fiscal plans were reasonably set, the schools and departments were asked to plan within those limits, and as funds were obtained, to add new staff and students. Throughout all phases, Stanford kept the fiscal plan sufficiently flexible so that it could be modified to accommodate new and fruitful program ideas. The plans were developed by a small groups of administrators led by the Vice President for Finance. At each step in the process, plans were reduced to writing so that people could react to something concrete.

Stanford found that a 10-year plan was suitable to establish broad guide lines, but that it could plan realistically and in detail only five years ahead. The university found it useful to compare itself constantly with similar institutions in such matters as tuition, salaries and endowment income, and sought to make realistic assumptions about expected cost increases.[1]

Stanford's planning emanated from the top. Principal administrative officers did most of the detail work. Vanderbilt, on the other hand, attempted a grass-roots approach. Its 10-year plan grew out of the Vanderbilt Planning Study. That study was conducted during 1963-64 and parts were completed in 1965. Each of 46 committees produced formal written reports. To add depth to those statements, some 25 additional reports were prepared by outside consultants.

---

[1] Kenneth M. Cuthbertson, "Long Range Financial Planning," Long Range Planning in Higher Education, Boulder, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

Out of these studies came recommendations which were implemented at once. By September, 1964, the university had acted upon more than 137 recommendations. The rest served as a basis for the 10-year plan. This did not constitute a simple addition of separate recommendations, but resulted from critical evaluation at each successive administrative level. Further, the plan was based on the following assumptions, both for the nation and for the University:

Nationally -

* The cold war will continue but there will not be a general or nuclear war.

* There will be no major depression, but prices will rise 2 per cent a year.

* Education will be the fastest growing sector of the economy.

* The cost of higher education will rise.

* Graduate and professional education will grow faster than undergraduate education.

* There will be a greater number of strong universities.

* University research will expand.

* College enrollments will expand.

* Public institutions will handle larger percentages of students.

* Private institutions will expand enrollment but at a slower rate than public institutions.

* Private institutions will be increasingly selective.

* All categories of financial support will increase.

* Federal support will increase.

* Endowments will grow but will be proportionately less significant in institutional finance.

- Tuition and fees will increase in both public and private higher education.
- Gifts and grants will increase but not proportionately.
- Higher education will become increasingly more efficient.

At Vanderbilt -

- General institutional objectives will remain unchanged.
- Undergraduate education is basic to the role of the university.
- Graduate and professional education will demand increased attention.
- Research will increase.
- Services to the community will expand in response to definite needs.
- The university will compete for distinction with national and international institutions.
- There will be controlled increases in enrollments.
- A policy of selective admissions will be followed.
- The number of students needing financial aid will increase.
- Sex ratios for undergraduates will remain stable.
- The university will continue its residential character.
- Students will expect campus to provide for cultural and social stimulation.
- Instructional programs will require continuous updating.
- Programs for superior students and of foreign study will be emphasized.
- Joint library services will be expanded.
- Plant utilization will be greater.
- Faculty and students will increase at existing ratios.

- Salaries will remain high.

- The quality of faculty will be improved.

To suggest the specificity of the report, the established priorities for the College of Arts and Science are presented in the appendix, Table XIII.[1]

Long range planning in public institutions must be conducted differently. It must frequently be based on established system-wide guide lines rather than assumptions. Florida's and California's planning seem somewhat more advanced than a number of other states', although substance as well as method differ.

At the University of South Florida the basic work of planning was done by an appointed committee headed by the Director of Institutional Research, and later by the Dean of Academic Affairs. This committee attempted to indicate the direction the University should move and described the programs which should be established. In a way, this represents an unusual technique. Except for the chairman, none of the committee members were part of the central administration. However, both president and business manager kept in constant touch with the planning, and in the end accepted the reports of the committee as their own views. For the most part, the committee accepted the State Board of Control's enrollment and economic projections, modifying them only slightly to conform to regional differences. The committee also accepted recommendations regarding the state's needs for specialized professional schools. Predictably, the final report was parsimonious. (See timetable and summary of plans in Appendix, page 217.)[1]

---

[1] Profile of Vanderbilt University, 1956-1976, 2 volumes.

The University of Kentucky used still another technique in planning its future. Prior to 1962-63 it had never conducted meaningful studies concerning the future, viewing itself as a Southern regional institution with limited aspirations and mission.

Since that time, however, the university has begun to change and aspire to national status. Its new president, John Oswald, began the process by raising such issues as those concerning institutional character, mission for graduate or undergraduate education, and the proper relationship of the university to the community college sector of the university system (there are 14 such branches). Faculty groups, departments, schools, and specialized units then studied and debated and finally produced an academic program. Its various provisions were thoroughly debated by the Academic Senate, approved, and in turn approved by the Board of Trustees as the blueprint for the future.

Not only did the academic plan indicate such broad goals as increasing research, but such specifics as a new concept of general education which would finally break the University's control over the curriculum of the specialized schools and colleges. The academic plan was followed by a development plan which indicated needed fiscal and physical resources consistent with the academic and research program requirements. Then, because the state's community colleges are part of the university system, each was required to conduct its own long range planning for curricula and campus building. Twelve such community college plans had been completed by late 1967, enabling the university to present their individual needs to the legislature.

---

[1] University of South Florida, Report on Role and Scope Study. April 1962, Tampa, Florida.

As the university moves to implement these plans, the president intends to start the process all over again for the next stage of development.

Ruml and Morrison urged that since neither the faculty nor president could effectively arrange an academic program, the Board of Trustees should reassert its legal right to do so.[1] Few institutions, however, have followed the suggestion. Kentucky's Transylvania College is apparently one of the few. An old, coeducational liberal arts college located in Lexington, Kentucky, Transylvania in recent years has found itself plagued with the full range of problems facing private colleges: difficulty in staff recruitment, increasing costs, competition from public institutions and changing character of student body. The college had managed to operate debt free but had done little to chart its future. Its president seemed content to report twice a year on his stewardship to the Board of Trustees. The picture changed, however, when one board member suggested that the college should begin to plan its future, and that the Board of Trustees should lead the effort.

---

[1] Ruml and Morrison, Memo to a College Trustee: A Report on Financial and Structural Problems of the Liberal College, Fund for Advancement of Education, New York, McGraw Hill, 1959.

The Board, with presidential approval, then created three joint board-faculty committees: one for physical plant, one for liberal arts studies, and one for an envisioned center for Latin American studies. A board member on each committee arranged for consultants to visit the campus and ultimately contracted with a private research firm to make appropriate studies for future planning.

The problem of involving the faculty and administration in implementing plans was never solved, but eventually a set of general goals and recommendations was prepared. The result clearly reflected the difference between planners responsible for implementation and planners who lack the power to make a plan operative.

The University of Minnesota represents still another approach to planning. The initiative is lodged in the president's office and exercised by several assistants who generate long range enrollment, space and financial projections based upon their understanding of the needs and conditions of Minnesota. The information, together with that generated by an Office of Institutional Research, is presented to the legislature and public by the president and his immediate advisers. Detailed planning is assumed to be the responsibility of the various schools and colleges.

Southern Methodist University created its master plan in response to a somewhat deteriorating educational and fiscal condition. The president and several members of the Board of Trustees realized that the institution had to make a major step forward to meet its community responsibilities. Such a step required exploiting its assets and correcting weaknesses.

The assets were a firm emphasis on academic freedom, a well-regarded president and considerable loyalty from Dallas, which regarded SMU as its own. Major weaknesses were low faculty morale, weak internal leadership, inadequate financial resources, and an apparent inability to meet the needs of business and industry.

The president appointed 18 groups to facilitate planning. Central among these were The Faculty Planning Committee, Master Planning Steering Committee, Student Master Plan Committee, The Committee of Fifty (friends of the institution), Council of Deans, and nine campus Task Forces. Each of these groups defined its role, worked with consultants, and offered proposals. Although this process succeeded, it also revealed further weaknesses or problems.

First among these was faculty reluctance to engage in planning. The University's inadequate record system became a problem. Morale, already low, continued to decline during the planning period. Indecision about the ultimate authority for the plan may have intensified the situation. Eventually, however, the president decided that he would take final responsibility for submitting it to the board of trustees. The plan was arrived at through open discussion, but no faculty vote was called. While it contained considerable detail, six features emerged as the most significant. These were:

- The creation of a University College to provide for the general education of all students.
- A rapid movement toward graduate and professional education.
- A resolve to improve faculty.
- A resolve to strengthen administration through annual appointment of department heads and the addition of several officers in central administration.
- A resolve to improve the quality of student life.
- A resolve to improve the financial support of the institution.

The board of trustees approved the plan that same spring, instructed the president to implement it, and approve almost $500,000 to aid the process. All department chairmen were asked to resign and were replaced by people who could put the plan into effect.[1]

These plans reasonably reflect planning as practiced in colleges and universities during the late 1950's and early 1960's. From them and others, it is possible to assess the technique employed.

As indicated previously, a number of institutions have developed planning offices. Most of their officers see the need for broad appraisal of the future, but are so caught up in the details of day-to-day operation and administration that real long range planning is almost impossible. When plans are produced they seem simply extrapolations from existing structures, rather than goals united by an overarching rationale.

---

[1] Jesse E. Hobson, "A Case Study in Institutional Planning," Long Range Planning in Higher Education, Boulder, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

The few examples of trustee planning suggest that this is a highly inappropriate technique. Such boards are not in contact with the bureaucracy which ultimately must implement the plan. A creative board generates many fresh ideas, but a lack of direct faculty involvement will prevent their implementation. Further, board planning seems to antagonize faculty, who can eventually defeat whatever is proposed.

A number of institutions have used consultants or "boards of visitors" in the planning process. It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of such devices. Outside resources probably have a definite place as a means of stimulating fresh thinking. However, if an institution relies too much on outside consultants, it finds itself in possession of a plan devised by people with no responsibility for final implementation. A case in point is St. Andrews College in Laurinberg, North Carolina, which used a board of consultants to plan its first academic program, and then 10 years later, a subsequent board to review progress and plot the next decade. While St. Andrews has progressed, the visitor feels that its faculty is not really involved with the institution or its program. They are simply carrying out orders.

One much publicized planning technique is variously described as systems analysis, cost benefit analysis or program analysis. Some of the publicity has stemmed from an attempt to use the technique in the Federal Department of Defense and to a lesser degree in the State Department. The president of the University of California was instrumental in creating the Defense Department program and has indicated that eventually the University of California will use program budgeting and cost benefit analysis. However, not even a theoretical model exists, and may not for some years. Several other institutions say they intend to develop such an approach, but present planning and budget-making is carried on in more traditional ways.

Today, many educators advocate a systems approach to planning. As one exponent argued, "Education should make projections and approximations of what might be expected in the future...approach its planning on the basis of systems study and with a view to the interactions of education systems with other systems in the environment and...undertake [planning] on a systematic basis rather than proceeding on the haphazard, fence-mending basis from which we now operate in education."[1] However, he also indicated that he knows of no system, university, or college in the United States which has taken a total systems look at itself. That was in 1965. In 1968 the condition appears the same.

Attempts by supra-institutional agencies to plan for individual institutions on a statewide basis also reveal considerable weakness. If the work is done by a limited statewide staff, the resulting plan will be too general and not based upon adequate supporting data. In several states, individual institutions feel constrained because the plans assigned them do not really indicate guide lines or projections that they can follow.

---

[1] David G. Ryans, "System Analysis in Planning," Long Range Planning in Higher Education, Boulder, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965.

On the other hand, if the statewide agency creates an adequate planning staff, the results are likely to be so detailed and specific that they limit institutional response to local conditions and demands. California state college administrators contend that plans developed in the chancellor's office are excessively restrictive.

In general, workable guide lines for institutional growth have been developed by institutions' central administrations or by well-organized faculty efforts expended over a reasonable period of time (18 to 24 months). It is difficult to determine which general approach is most effective. Stanford and the University of Kentucky seem satisfied with broadly outlined plans developed by a small group of administrators. But Vanderbilt and the University of Hawaii also seem pleased that they asked the faculty to do the initial work.

To this writer, however, it is increasingly clear that the central administration is more critical and significant than the faculty. In those institutions which have experienced some success with faculty discussions, it was the president and his chief advisers who established the general goals and framework, and who eventually forged the results into a coherent statement for action.

A word must be said about the use of professional planning firms. The evolution of these firms is a relatively recent and growing phenomenon. The University of Alaska, the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, and Friends University in Kansas have used such firms for facilities, detailed program, and administrative planning. The resulting documents show a professional polish and quality, probably reflect current opinion quite accurately, and offer even considerable innovation.

It is too early to tell whether or not a faculty can creatively implement such plans. But one can question the approach on theoretical grounds. If planning is best done by those who will be responsible for implementation, then over-reliance on an outside planning agency should be avoided. This does not mean that specialized services should not be used. But it does suggest that those who comprise an institution should be the oneschiefly concerned with the establishment of broad goals and basic character.

Ideally, long range plans should be based upon historical statistics for enrollment, income expenditures and program evolution, as well as assumptions about forces likely to operate in the future. But institutions have generally lacked such historical information, or lacked it in forms adaptable to projection. In the absence of this kind of information, many projections have been informed guesses made in a relatively short time. Stanford's plan has been cited as one of the more effective plans, but its projected field and level enrollments were worked out in a few hours by several junior members of the central administration. Most of Yale's planning figures have been worked out by an officer in its development office, and while they are more detailed than most, are still based on assumptions arrived at rather casually.

It is probably true that some forecast figures are better than none, and that informed opinion can predict with some accuracy what is likely to happen. But it would be a serious mistake to consider even detailed projections as highly precise instruments. Most institutions of higher education seem to develop in response to external factors. A case in point is Michigan State University's response to a multimillion-dollar gift earmarked for a branch of the university. Just weeks prior to the announcement of the gift, the state's long range planning committee had announced against establishing branches of any state-supported institution. Michigan State University-Oakland was created within a year.

Long Beach State College in California is another example. Its anticipated enrollment level has been variously stated as 5,000, 10,000, 15,000 and 20,000 students. Nor have informed individuals been any more precise. In the late 1950's, Robert Havighurst predicted a decline in higher educational enrollments during the decade of the fifties.

Nonetheless, planning by institutions is increasing and may well become better and more precise. As planning evolves it appears to be based on a number of assumptions which may or may not be warranted:

(1) That planning is critically important to American higher education;

(2) That institutional research can provide the information needed for effective planning;

(3) That the program budgeting approach will eventually make planning a more precise science;

(4) That the advent of the computer will make planning much easier and more precise;

(5) That despite warnings to the contrary, the application of management principles, derived in part from the study of business, can somehow make long range planning better;

(6) That the behavioral sciences can not only predict individual but institutional behavior, and that these sciences should be, and eventually will be, very much of the planners art, and

(7) That some idealized form of complex institution is possible. Whether the school be a liberal arts college, state college, middle level university or prestige university, planning seems directed toward a concept of improvement, and improvement in this context means greater complexity.

## CHAPTER VI

## Assessment of Planning and Coordination

It seems beyond question that the various efforts at long range planning for higher education and the creation of new statewide governance systems is a national or even an international phenomenon. The number of councils, committees or commissions created and plans developed since 1960 indicates an accelerating trend which probably will not be reversed. While specific details will vary from state to state, most plans and coordination efforts conform to a pattern. Generally, they rest on common assumptions about the nature and needs of governance and higher education.

These phenomena are apparent in the patterns of enrollment cost, complexity and significance. Even in states where the population is static or declining, it is assumed that the proportion of college age youth is increasing and that the demand for higher education is expanding. Various rates are postulated, but a 1 to 1.5 per cent annual enrollment increase is the usually quoted figure.

Enrollments are expected to rise at least through 1980, and the states are obligated to provide the necessary new facilities. Almost without exception, coordinating groups accept the idea that some opportunity for higher education should be provided for every qualified person, and that the number of qualified people could rise to within 80 per cent of the age group. Further planning is based on the assumption that the cost of higher education will increase at rates of 5 to 10 per cent each year. This is caused by inflation, the steady increases expected in faculty salaries, mounting cost of facilities construction and the increasing price of more complex educational materials. Higher education is expected to consume a large and larger share of the total budget of a state. Indeed, this is frequently advanced as the chief reason for creating a coordinating agency. It is assumed that such an agency can maximize the benefits of massive state expenditure for higher education.

The second assumption is that increased costs and enrollments will force state government to become more and more directly involved in institutional affairs. There was a time when the constitutional universities felt they were almost a fourth branch of government, and when other institutions, with their separate boards of trustees, considered themselves relatively free from governmental control.

Such freedom now seems incompatible with the substantial demands for state financing, and the significance, real or supposed, of higher education in a state's economy. Essential state services, including the taxpayer's interests, need protection to insure the efficient deployment of resources. Yet there is an awareness that close involvement of state government, resting as it does on partisan politics, could destroy the freedom which is an essential characteristic of higher education. Thus a new agency had to be created to insure involvement of state government without political overtones. If legislatures attempted direct supervision, institutions would run the risk of such burdens as civil service standards for appointment, administrative changes linke to changes in the legislature, or budgetary control by the state budget director. But tighter control is seen as a necessity. Hence the concept of a coordinating agency, sensitive to both the political and educational expressions of state government, seems to provide a mediating force.

This new agency--a coordinating council, committee or commission--which the majority of states have created or are creating, is assumed to be a centralized agency representing the public. Staffed with professional people, it can mediate between the specialized needs and demands of institutions and the political and financial concerns of the legislature.

In the eyes of many, other education agencies adhere closely either to institutions or to state government. Thus, institutional regents or trustees are associated with schools. State boards of education, however, are usually looked upon as part of the state bureaucracy; almost political in character. This assumption may be inferred from the typical functions of a coordinating agency. It usually reviews institutional budget requests and frequently combines those from several institutions into a consolidated request. It should accumulate data and make long range studies to suggest the role and scope of college and university missions within the system. And it frequently has the power to review and act on proposed new programs, determining whether or not the state needs and can afford a program.

Such an agency is assigned a most difficult task. If it acts too often in favor of institutional demands it becomes suspect in the legislature. If it deviates too greatly from institutional requests it is regarded as just another state agency, unduly responsive to political forces. But the advocates of such agencies assume that a structure can be created which will maintain a balance, and that it can gradually gain public recognition as a new force in higher education.

Most master plans, state studies and coordinating-group efforts assume that a state's educational needs vary and are best served by several types of institutions. The familiar tripartite concept of university, general college and two-year junior or lower division branch college is the formula most often encountered. But the concept remains an assumption, because it runs counter to a long-standing pattern of institutional development in American higher education, i.e., the evolution of schools toward a mean of complex multipurpose institutions.

Thus liberal arts colleges expand into teacher preparation, business, music, home economics and even some form of graduate work, while technical institutes become comprehensive universities polarized around science and technology. And the same tendency exists within junior colleges. A few states refuse to assume institutional variation, preferring that all institutions grow and expand. But the majority seem to feel that financial resources can be best used if individual colleges and universities are assigned definite roles.

The next assumption is basic to the entire development. It is simply that long range planning for a state's higher education needs is possible, and that decisions made in the light of such plans are likely to be better than ad hoc decisions.

At first thought this might seem more than an assumption. But it has by no means been established that public policy, of which decisions about higher education are really a part, is created by long range rational planning. One point of view holds that state agencies and institutions assume a life and force of their own, and that public policy is created through the tension existing between agencies, pressure groups and political parties in response to rapidly changing conditions. M. M. Chambers argues that there is no evidence that California, with its tradition of planning, is better served educationally than is Indiana or Michigan, with a tradition of allowing tension and competition between institutions. Chambers implies that the burden of proof really rests with the advocates of planning.

Furthermore, Chambers believes that the output of Michigan, Indiana and Illinois before coordination was equal if not superior to that of California and New York, which have a longer history of supra-institutional control. In fact, he elevates his belief in institutional freedom to a credo:

> Regents, trustees, presidents and deans are also human. Most of them know that the priceless and indispensible ingredient in a superior higher educational enterprise is morale--the feeling on the part of students, teachers, administrators,

> board members and all others concerned that the institution is an excellent one, and unique. Morale cannot be forced. . can only be fostered. If this be true of universities and colleges, it is not too difficult a step to the idea that all possible care ought to be taken to perpetuate and expand their freedom to be unique according to their own policies.[1]

Chambers' point is reinforced by those who believe that the California Master Plan did little except codify a system of higher education which had already developed, and that the net effect was to harden an historical condition into a rigid and inflexible structure.

Very likely, however, the assumption will prevail that higher education is best served as part of public policy, that orientation is clearly explicit in master plans and in the missions of coordinating agencies. Perhaps those states that claim no formal coordination have in fact achieved it through voluntary cooperation, which carries almost the same force as a legislated coordination system.

Related is the assumption, apparently growing in popularity, that institutional cooperation without legal sanction is an impossible ideal. After watching California's efforts to forge a semi-cooperative system of higher education, T. R. McConnell at last reached the conclusion that some central agency had to be assigned power to enforce decisions regarding finance and role and scope if institutional ambitions were to be held within budgetary limits. We must discover whether or not enforced coordination is necessary, and whether or not it can be effective in a basic conflict between an institution and a coordinating agency. There are enough instances of institutions circumventing the guide lines of coordinating agencies to place in question the possibility of even enforced coordination.

---

[1] M. M. Chambers, Freedom and Repression in Higher Education, Bloomington, Bloomcraft Press, 1965.

An underlying premise may also require testing, i.e., is it true that a state needs coordination to assure more effective utilization of resources in the face of competing demands? Most states seem to feel that it is.

Still another assumption is rooted in the theories of such people as David Starr Jordan and William R. Harper,[1] who argued that lower division college work should be offered by institutions other than universities. Junior colleges, or branches of four-year institutions, have been created in the expectation that these institutions will really serve the function Harper and Jordan had in mind.

In several states (Florida and Illinois among them) universities have been created or planned without provision for lower division work. California tries to redistribute students so that the majority of eventual baccalaureate recipients will have taken their lower division work at a junior college. It is assumed that such institutions can offer valid lower division work at less cost, both to the student, the public, than would obtain in a four-year college or university. The California system is frequently cited as a model of junior college operation.

Nevertheless, the junior college concept must be considered an assumption. It is by no means clear that the junior college, even in California, actually educates more than a small percentage of those who eventually receive a bachelor's degree. Nor is it clear that a system of junior colleges provides real economies to a state. On the contrary, some hold that the financing of comprehensive universities depends heavily on large numbers of undergraduates. Not only do they comprise the teaching loads for graduate students who in turn provide part of the subsidy for graduate work and research, but they provide low cost instruction units which help balance the expensive upper division and graduate courses.

---

[1] Former presidents of Stanford and the University of Chicago, respectively.

Another assumption argues that the state needs trained manpower, and that colleges and universities can provide it, not only in the traditional professions of medicine, law and engineering, but in many new fields as well. Much of the justification for expansion of graduate, professional, technical, and vocational programs is based on this assumption. But once again, the assumption has not been established as fact. The relationship between undergraduate vocational preparation and subsequent vocational performance is tenuous at best. Perhaps different graduate training would indeed produce the technical workers our society needs. But this is not presently known. More teachers with the Ph.D. are needed, as are workers in the health and some engineering fields. But until we actually examine the careers of the thousands earning masters degrees, the matter must remain moot.

A last assumption which underlies virtually all of the state master plans and efforts to develop higher education systems, holds that a definite relationship exists between a thriving system of higher education and a state's economy. Higher education is presumed to create trained manpower, which then attracts new commerce and industry. A university is presumed to attract the people and conduct the research that encourages continued economic expansion. States with slow economic development are led, through the examples of such regions as the San Francisco peninsula or the greater Boston area, to believe that the key to economic growth lies in creating a vital system of higher education.

Perhaps this assumption is indeed a fact. But little evidence has been presented beyond supportive statistics, so for the moment it must be considered assumption.

Since long range master planning and coordinating boards have so recently entered the higher educational scene, a definitive assessment of their effectiveness is impossible. But some apparent successes and failures can be presented and some crucial questions raised.

We can identify a number of weaknesses, even failures, of master planning or coordination. Lip service is usually given to the need for both public and private higher education. Many praise the virtues of pluralistic educational opportunity for a pluralistic society. But the fundamental problems of private education, with few exceptions, are left untouched. Sometimes they are left untouched because of state constitutional provisions against aid to religiously-related institutions. And sometimes it is assumed that the private sector is incapable of expanding at rates necessary to gratify the educational aspirations of the people. It is true that Pennsylvania's private institutions have been aided. It is also true that the Bundy report for New York and probably the McConnell committee in Illinois are attempting to solve problems of private higher education. But the majority of master plans and state higher education surveys leave the distinct impression that little serious thought has been given to the private sector. This may change, but so far the evidence does not suggest movement.

Private higher education urgently needs new resources to keep pace with rising costs. Even major prestige universities are beginning to operate through deficit spending and some smaller private colleges actually have difficulty meeting a monthly payroll. Since the end of World War II and especially since 1957 or 1958, these institutions have met part of their financial needs by raising tuitions. But the pace of tuition increases must slow if the majority of private institutions are to compete for students. In the fall of 1967 several private institutions enrolled fewer freshmen than anticipated, desired and needed. Students given the choice between attending expensive St. Louis University or inexpensive University of Missouri-St. Louis, are beginning to respond to economic forces.

Perhaps the demise or decline of private higher education is in the best interests of the society. At the turn of the 20th Century, public secondary education wielded less influence than private. Presently, of course, the roles are reversed. The vast majority of high school students attend the public sector. Some feel that such a course is the logical and desirable one. If so, it is quite appropriate for a state system to place new institutions in the same areas as private universities of similar type in the full knowledge that the private school must change its mission and clientele or suffer reduction in enrollment. Metro State College in Denver, the expanded City University of New York and the Boston branch of the University of Massachusetts have all influenced private universities in such ways. The University of Denver, New York University and Boston University are trying to change their missions. But there is doubt that they can without massive support.

If, however, the virtues of a dual system are real and the values of an influential private sector established, state master plans and systems must be judged delinquent or ineffective if they fail to provide for the maintenance of a strong private sector. Spokesmen for both public and private higher education praise the virtues of a pluralistic system. But the inference must remain that most state officials' chief concern is the expansion and support of public higher education.

No master planners have accepted Allan Cartter's thesis that it would be less expensive for a state to help maintain private institutions than to create new facilities for those students who could not be served if the private institutions were to go under. The thesis has been tested by converting several private to public institutions, i.e., the University of Missouri, Kansas City or SUNY-Buffalo. But it is equally true that the thesis has not been validated on a state wide basis.

That, however, is beside the point. The puzzle is that master plans, concerned as they are with maximum utility from tax dollars, have not at least examined possible aid to private institutions. No master plan or agency has suggested that many private liberal arts colleges could, with state support, expand capacity and continue to perform the regional junior college function which they really have performed in the past. This is clearly not the function of a handful of nationally-known liberal arts colleges--i.e., Reed, Oberlin, Williams, Antioch or Stephens. But historically, it has been the function of the hundreds of little known liberal arts colleges which dot the country, and especially the Midwest; Alderson-Broaddus, Marian, Marion, Huntington, Ashland and Northland, to name just a few.

A second weakness already brought into question, should be stressed because it figures so basically in the claimed achievements of state higher education systems. This is the matter of junior and community colleges, and the roles they should properly fill.

In theory, junior colleges provide lower division baccalaureate work, general, technical-vocational, and adult education, and serve as community cultural centers. Theoretically, in an elaborate junior college system, these two-year institutions are expected to provide work for an increasing number of students who will transfer to a four-year institution to complete their bachelor's degree requirements. It is presumed that once the system is in operation, the productivity of the entire state system will increase. The junior college provides opportunity for under-achieving students to compensate for previous deficiencies, for students who cannot afford four full years away from home, and for students who previously had not been motivated to attend college.

In general, students who transfer from junior colleges to four-year institutions perform similarly to native students in a four-year college or university. While attrition during the junior year (first year of transfer) is somewhat higher than for native students and grade point averages are somewhat lower, overall performance is comparable.[1] Junior college products can apparently transfer successfully to a four-year institution. But that is beside the point where planning agencies are concerned. The real point is whether enough students transfer to warrant support of junior colleges.

---

[1] Dorothy M. Knoell & Leland L. Medsker, Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges, Berkeley, University of California, 1964.

Master plans stress the needs for technical-vocational education and indicate the public's desire to provide educational opportunity for all qualified youth in the state. Further, they seek to create a diversified system to meet the varying needs of the state. The criticism is that plans have been parsimonious and too uncritical of systems in which junior colleges have played an essential part. Perhaps future plans will be more inventive. Perhaps they will examine results and call the notion into question.

In California, which runs the country's most elaborate system of junior colleges, only about a third of junior college's freshman class reenters as sophomores, and approximately a third of that group transfers into the junior year at a four-year institution. Thus, only 10-12 per cent of California junior college freshmen classes actually transfer. This contrasts sharply with the proportion--approximately 75 per cent of that group, who say they entered to transfer.

Nor has an elaborate junior college structure affected productivity of bachelor's degree recipients. Again California data is instructive. In 1960-62, the ratio was six freshmen to one bachelor's degree. The ratio was exactly the same in 1965-67. For women in 1960-62, the ratio was 5.8 freshmen to one bachelor's degree, but 6.5 in 1965-67. Moreover, the growth of junior colleges in California has not really affected the mix of lower and upper division students at the University of California since 1958.

If we assume that one of the most, if not the most critical domestic problem facing American society is the task of bringing the Negro into the mainstream of American life, and that the job will require major and explicit effort, then state systems and their master plans must be judged remiss. Few, if any plans or studies focus specifically on this problem, or indicate that it may require different sorts of schools or different efforts by existing institutions.

Except for generalized recommendations that institutions should be located in the most populous areas, scant attention is paid to the needs of the central city. There are, of course, several exceptions. The master plan and its revision for the City University of New York attempts to plan for total educational opportunity by the mid-1970's and envisions a wide range of post-high school institutions to remedy the severe cultural disadvantage of the Negro and Puerto Rican populations.

The State University of New York has also investigated the possibility of need for some new sort of institution to serve the central city. While its answer was no, "...that the State University should look to its present two-year colleges to expand opportunity before considering seriously the creation of a new type of institution--in effect, a third type of public junior college..."[1], the fact that it considered the matter at all makes it unique.

---

[1] Dorothy M. Knoell, Law and Educational Opportunity for All, Albany State University of New York, 1966.

It can be argued that wherever a significant minority group problem exists, whether it be rural communities in Maine, Indian reservations in New Mexico, Mexican population centers in Los Angeles or Negro centers in all large American cities, states should begin making explicit provisions for their higher educational needs. If the assumption concerning quality of educational opportunity is to be acted upon seriously, all 10-25 year enrollment projections for higher education would be painfully conservative.

If, for example, state plans called for Negro educational proportionate to the Negro population, some 700,000 new students would be involved each year. Obviously the problems of poverty, of the Negro and of the ghetto demand effort at all levels, and perhaps even greater effort at the pre-school level. But there have been just enough experiments, such as the one at the University of California at Berkeley, to suggest that higher education need not wait for solutions to the problems of lower grade schooling. Again, this means asking master planners to transcend their own culture and to break with conventional thinking. But those who would plan for the future should be expected to make such an effort.

Two subjective factors must be raised, because they deal with individuals and their own biases and backgrounds. In the fiscal analyses, state surveys and master plans are drafted by professional staffs and consultants. At present, the number of consultants with experience in complete state studies is somewhat limited, hence many who do this work operate in several different states. One tends to feel that if he knows the background and orientation of a chief consultant he can predict the details of a proposed plan with reasonable accuracy. Thus planning, and ultimately plans, may depend too heavily on the work of a few individuals.

An even more sensitive area is the background, experience and energy of the person selected to head a state coordinating agency. Theoretically, he is expected to command salary, stature and experience equal to that awarded to presidents of the system's senior institutions. And in a few states this seems, in fact, to have happened. But one feels that presidents of individual institutions are reluctant to see a vigorous and dynamic person appointed to the coordination role. And perhaps this is a wise reluctance. A driving personality could disrupt the sensitive balance between control and coordination, which now seems so essential. But a person willing to function without exerting much personal leadership may be overwhelmed by institutional power, or become just another governmental bureaucrat. Perhaps the necessary traits of a state coordinator should be subjected to closer, more exhaustive scrutiny. Job specifications and the kinds of people selected to fill them sometimes seem quite inconsistent.

Several weaknesses impinge directly on institutional character or autonomy. The first takes several forms and involves institutional role and scope.

In Missouri the state system proclaimed that the Kansas City, St. Louis, and Columbia campuses should each be comprehensive universities with full complements of graduate and professional schools. This led the officials of the two younger campuses--Kansas City and St. Louis--to plan for such a structure. But their requests for legislative support were rebuffed. This problem probably precipitated the resignation of the Kansas City chancellor in the late summer of 1967.

The promise and authorization of a coordinating group where none exists causes institutions some indecision about planning. A case in point is Rutgers, the state university of New Jersey. Some consolidation of the law school effort is needed, as is some indication of which graduate responsibilities Rutgers should relinquish to the state teachers colleges. But until quite recently, planning has been held up by a lack of central direction. This vagueness in the matters of role and scope is especially troublesome, since it is difficult to describe what various sorts of institutions are or should be.

The concept of a comprehensive university is reasonably clear. It has an arts college, a graduate school, one or more professional schools, and may offer the doctorate. But what characterizes the next level? In California, the state college's non-doctoral limitation, plus a somewhat higher teaching load, seem central in distinguishing between a university and a state college.

That this is scarcely enough to guide institutional development is well illustrated by several of the larger state colleges, i.e., San Francisco, San Jose and Los Angeles. These have a number of large departments offering course work appropriate for strong doctoral work. The general college concept is so amorphous that a vigorously-led institution can be encouraged to move to comprehensive university status in all respects save name.

Belatedly, a number of state colleges designated as future comprehensive universities may have been led to set themselves impossible goals, particularly with respect to immediate graduate and professional work. Long-standing teaching institutions lack the cadre of a research-oriented faculty that can create graduate centers overnight. But the timetables presented to such places suggest that they will be major graduate centers by 1980. Michigan State University is approaching a high level of graduate and professional work in several areas, but the decision to attempt such a development was readied 24 years ago.

Then there is the matter of institutional autonomy. Most state coordinating agencies and master plans try to differentiate between coordination and control. Control, in those states where boards direct individual schools or clusters of institutions, is presumably left to those boards, administration, and faculties. But the line is drawn between coordination and control, and its crossing-point is perceived differently by representatives of institutions and coordinating agencies. In Colorado, for instance, the director of the Commission on Higher Education feels that his office allows institutions all necessary freedom. But the head of the state college system feels that the commission's review of budgets and new programs places great strictures on institutional autonomy.

This is a vexing matter, because little data exists to indicate how frequently essential institutional plans have been jeopardized by coordinating agencies. But the threat is always present. T. R. McConnell observes "We may expect to see the tension between institutional independence and public accountability grow in intensity. There will be greater stress between the desire for autonomy and the pressure for coordinated effort. It will take all the statesmanship the academic community and government together can muster to enable colleges and universities to serve the broader public interest while preserving the identity, the integrity, the initiative and the morale of individual institutions and, especially, the intellectual freedom of faculty and students."[1]

While the reasons are understandable, current state master plans and coordination systems rarely project beyond 1975 or 1980. But it may be necessary to look beyond those dates if the creation of new facilities is to keep pace with actual need. Present population trends indicate a strong possibility of college enrollment decline.

---

[1] T. R. McConnell et al, Governments and the University, Toronto, The MacMillan Co. of Canada, 1966.

after 1980. Yet a number of plans imply that enrollment will continue to increase in absolute numbers. The students of 1987 have already been born. It would seem logical that states planning higher education should project at least to that year. Then decisions could be made about such things as enrolling larger numbers of minority groups.

Several other minor weaknesses should be mentioned before assessing actual systems accomplishments. First, documents about the future of higher education are usually long and dreary. One cannot be optimistic that they have been or will be read. Surely, since most of them involve broad policy, such documents could be more tersely phrased.

Second, the funds called for may be unrealistic in the light of state resources and the demands for other services. For example, capital outlay in rapidly growing states may be so high as to generate a public backlash over the costs of education. It can be argued that higher education is riding a wave of public popularity, and that projections of need are based on the assumption that that popularity will continue. This is a dubious assumption. There is some evidence that foundations and some legislatures are turning away from higher education as the most deserving social service.

Third, plans perpetuate the concept of institutional boards without really examining whether the local board is still a viable agency. There is some reason to believe that overgrown institutional bureaucracies deny boards essential information on which to make decisions. And as other critical information is concentrated at the supra-institutional level, there can be real question as to what, outside of voting on a president, is left for an institutional board.

Apparently, however, the movement toward long range planning and coordination has contributed much, although this is difficult to document.

Coordination and long range planning have served to expose higher education and its needs to the public. On many matters, a coordinating agency speaks for at least the public sector of higher education. And in states such as California or Illinois, it speaks with considerable authority. In California, Coordinating Council statements receive front page treatment from the metropolitan press.

Coordination and long range planning efforts may have made legislators more sophisticated in weighing the demands of higher education. This seems especially true in states such as Colorado, Illinois and Ohio, where the advice of the coordinating agency is much respected.

Master plans and state studies have begun to accumulate enough data to uncover weaknesses and malfunctioning of higher education segments. Several coordinating agencies, such as those in California, Illinois, Georgia and New York have produced studies and reports of value, not only to the states, but to the entire profession as well.

The very existence of an agency standing between governor and legislature on the one hand and institution on the other has probably eased tensions between them, allowed more objective conversation about finances and even prevented some state governments from injecting themselves directly into institutional concerns. As financial demands for higher education increase, it seems quite clear that state agencies will be more and more tempted to control those funds. A coordinating agency can at least blunt this resolve.

By its predication on equal opportunity, master planning has forced attention on regions previously neglected by public higher education. Also by its very nature, master planning has forced institutions and states to make long range financial forecasts. In the past, budgeting was usually conducted on a year-by-year basis. And for some purposes this procedure is still necessary. However, anticipation of future needs is wise, not only for planning, but also for alerting the public to the cost it will eventually have to bear. John Dale Russell's Ohio and Michigan studies in the 1950's, which indicated an under-supply, rather than the previously supposed over-supply of higher learning institutions, probably helped create a climate favorable to the provision of vastly increased resources.

Especially in Eastern states, where the tradition of private education has been strong, long range planning has clearly helped launch complex systems of public higher education. A long series of studies in New Jersey at last bore the fruit of a system. In Massachusetts and New York long range plans finally convinced people and legislatures that private institutions were inadequate for the needs of the state Planning obviously lies behind the significant developments of the past several years in those states.

It also seems clear that a pattern of coordination is emerging in most states, as well, and that this evolution has assumed a typical form. Once again T. R. McConnell's remarks are relevant:

> The number of states with some form of coordinating agency has increased from seventeen to forty-one since 1940. During this period there have been significant changes in the structure, organization, and powers of coordinating bodies. First, there is a tendency for agencies created by statute to replace purely voluntary coordinating bodies, such as the Council of State University Presidents in Michigan, which it is not unfair to say, were often established primarily as a means of heading off statutory mandates to curb wasteful competitive practices. Second, the evidence indicates clearly that purely voluntary methods of coordination are no longer effective, and voluntary agencies are being superseded by those with statutory status and authority.[1]

Presently these agencies can be classified as one of two types. They are either lay groups, advisory to public government (as in Missouri), or lay groups with professional staffs which exercise some control over institutional budgets, programs and admissions policies. In view of the forces that have caused coordination, one can only predict that the latter will eventually prevail, i.e., an agency with a professional staff which exercises some direct control over budgets, construction and new programs. A few states will probably resist out of peculiar traditions or circumstances.

---

[1] T. R. McConnell, op. cit., 83.

But for the most part, the direction of evolution seems clear:

A generalized pattern embracing elements of the California, New York and Ohio systems will probably develop.

There are likely to be three boards of control, one for each of the three higher education segments, plus some form of chancellor-style administration.[1]

Local or institutional boards will lose most perogatives but continue to exist for limited advisory purposes.

A coordinating agency will mediate between the boards of control and the state government, maintaining an advisory role in the governor's office.

This structure will be loosened somewhat by granting institutions freedom to evolve, within established policies, toward more complex types of institutions. For example, each institution will be assigned a role and scope, required to do academic long range planning, and also be allowed to plan evolution.

The eventual form is still unclear, because there are no good models, but the problems and needs of private higher education are such that it must be involved more directly in statewide coordination and control. Several possibilities are under discussion:

The first is that private institutions, especially the middle-level universities, will become state-affiliated institutions after the pattern of Temple, Pittsburgh and Buffalo, Or states may work out some form of state grants committee which will allocate funds to private institutions conforming to one requirement: a more precise form of public accountability, possibly to the grants committee itself. Or there may be large enough state scholarship programs so that residents of a state may make a reasonably free choice between public and private higher education.

---

[1] However, as this is being written some in California are urging an end to the tri-partite system in favor of a single system operating through regions.

Still another, less comprehensive option, is a series of cooperative arrangements between public and private institutions worked out under the auspices of the coordinating agency. Missouri is already attempting something of this sort.

On balance, it seems obvious that some form of higher education coordination and some level of long range planning are present on the American as well as the international scene. Higher Education has become too complex, expensive and significant to be allowed to function in its earlier hit-or-miss fashion.

## Chapter VII

# THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Out of state master plans, state studies of higher education and reports from and visits to individual institutions, emerge the outlines of American higher education in 1980.

The future of American higher education cannot escape its setting. Barring major war or severe economic recession, the outlines of American society for 1980 are reasonably clear. There will be upwards of 230 million people, half of whom will be under 26 years old. More than 22 million will be over 65. Some 80-85 percent will live in urban areas, and a third will live in ten super cities like the continuous metropolitan belts from Boston to Washington, from Gary, Indiana well into Wisconsin, or from Mobile past New Orleans. Half of those living in the cities will dwell in complex suburban areas, while the other half, including a disproportionate number of non-whites, will occupy the central city. The work week will average 30 hours or less and the average income after taxes will be $8,724 compared with the $6,285 in 1962.

The broad educational context is also relevant. In 1975, children in kindergarten through grade eight will number 31.5 million, 7.6 million more than in 1965. There will be 15 million high school students in 1975; 8.2 million more than in 1955. Fall enrollments in college degree work will rise from 1955's total of 2.7 million to nine million in 1975 and perhaps 12 million in 1980.

Graduate enrollment, which has become the fastest growing segment of higher education, will reach 1.1 million by 1975 and perhaps 2 million by 1980 (a number just over the total collegiate population in the mid 1950's). The great majority, perhaps 80-85 per cent, will atend public higher education and a good three-fourths will attend institutions enrolling more than 20,000 students. Expenditures for higher education will nearly double; from the $11.4 billion of 1965-66 to $22.5 billion in 1975-76. Capital outlay during the period 1966-67 to 1976 will be more than $30 billion--compared with the entire gross national product of $56 billion in 1933.

Such a vision can be frightening, especially to those who lived through childhood in small towns, in sleepy suburbs or on farms, and who attended one of the small liberal arts colleges of three to five hundred students which dotted, and for that matter still do dot, the American landscape. But Americans can no more escape this vision than they can escape the reality of atomic power, jet superliners or automation. It includes the facts which must govern the future development of higher education and the forces with which we must contend if we are to modify the shape of higher education in any rational way.

Given observable tendencies it is quite possible to predict with reasonable accuracy the outlines of higher education in 1980; only twelve years from now. But such predictions are only extrapolations and could be invalidated if conditions or traditions changed. Beyond that, however, predictions are possible for at least six areas.

The first is structure and organization.

It is clear that most states will create supra-institutional boards of control or coordination to insure more economical use of tax money and full accomplishment of their education missions. A few states, especially in the Midwest, will feel that state-wide control and coordination are detrimental to institutional creativity. At least one Southern state may perpetuate the anarchy that characterizes its approach to higher education, but most will create some form of state-wide organization. The prototype, of course, is California, with its junior colleges, state colleges and university. In the past three or four years this pattern has come to prevail in most master planning.

In general, institutions comprising state systems will be large The various campuses of the Universities of California, Illinois and Missouri will average 25,000 to 27,000 students, and such institutions as Michigan State, Minnesota and the City University of New York, will range between 45,000 and 65,000 students. Some remote junior colleges will remain small, and the universities and state colleges in areas where the population is stable, static or declining, will not reach enormous size. But even those may double their present enrollments just because the population's age composition is shifting. Typical undergraduate students in 1980 will attend colleges or universities averaging 20,000 students.

While the publicly supported institutions will be the largest, even the private institutions seem likely to seek the economies of scale by growing. Some will expand enrollments mainly at the graduate level. This is particularly true of private schools located in densely populated urban areas, such as Boston University. But smaller liberal arts colleges will also double in size, partly to obtain needed tuition money. Others, however, will grow through merger. The suggested union of Vassar and Yale is just behind the actual merger of Case and Western Reserve. Further mergers are made feasible by the growing number of college associations. Still other institutions will grow through a change of mission and an infusion of public funds. The University of Kansas City and Temple University have each experienced pronounced growth since they became state-affiliated.

Although definite evidence is not yet available, there is good reason to expect a major expansion of the higher educational efforts of non-educational institutions. Recent mergers of publishers and large manufacturers indicate a belief on the part of corporation leaders that a large educational market is on the horizon. Federal education funds are likely to become available for profit-making organizations. Some believe that private industry can offer certain higher education services more effectively than non-profit schools and colleges.

Clearly, the Federal government will be increasingly influential in the support and even the conduct of higher education. Universities expect the amount of faculty research to increase to between one third and half of the work load, and to be largely supported by Federal funds. Responsible administrators of distinguished private universities see some form of sanitized direct Federal support as the only way for private higher education to remain viable.

It is impossible to predict the precise forms that Federal support will take, but the profession seems to be asking for direct institutional grants; some form of tuition relief, especially for more graduate students; continuation of project contracts, and marked increases in funds for facilities. The idea of a national board of education or of elevating education to cabinet level is for the moment quiescent, but a reconsideration of some such notion seems warranted if Federal financial involvement increases at expected rates.

In 1965, partly in an attempt to create a third force which would temper the centralization that Federal programs implied, considerable attention was given to the Educational Compact of the States. Although the compact is now a fact, there is no evidence that it or similar structures are seriously viewed as influential. When institutions mention external organizations which affect their planning, and of course their growth, the state coordinating agencies and the Federal government are the only two that appear relevant. And with good reason. Major influence requires major financial resources. At present, any one of several hundred universities have larger operating budgets than the Compact, and the states, pressed as they are with drastic demands for more building and expanded university budgets, are unlikely to increase their contributions.

Although the Council of the States may not evolve as a powerful force, regional compacts and consortia probably will. The three regional compacts--Southern, Western and New England--have made important contributions in the health fields and in stimulating institutional research as a basis for planning. They seem likely to grow in significance. Several of the regional compacts have sponsored or produced significant research; even exceeding that produced by university centers for the study of higher education. Regional consortia of institutions, both public and private, have developed plans for cooperation and may develop a style of academic organization that can offer students experience in both public and private institutions with a minimum of administrative difficulty. Even regional accrediting agencies seem to have outgrown the state of being regarded as a nuisance and bother, and are seeking, within their own spheres of interest, to help institutions plan for the future.

Second is the matter of programs and curricula. Clearly, graduate work will become even more significant in the total higher education effort. As the bachelor's degree becomes more and more common, society will require some other educational criterion for ranking and sorting people. The master's degree is presently emerging as that symbol. Virtually every developing institution anticipates rapid increases in master's arts and sciences work, and in new problem-centered master's degree programs in such fields as resources control, urban problems and museum curatorship. An emerging new mission is that of retreading professional people, and the master's degree is seen as an appropriate indicator of such retraining. A good example is a one-or two-year program leading to the Master of Business Administration for people whose bachelor's degree in engineering is five or ten years old.

While doctoral work will expand and many more institutions will offer the doctorate (developing institutions all anticipate approval of doctoral education), the changes in the nature of the degree and its relative significance are not likely to be as profound as those related to the master's. While the press has given considerable attention to the ABD degree, graduate deans and faculties do not really expect this to materialize as an important symbol. The automatic certificate of candidacy, as at the University of Minnesota, will probably remain in evidence but will signify little.

Considerable change can be expected in several professional areas. Medical education, for example, is in for major reorientation, with emphasis placed on more and more precise diagnosis through bio-chemical and computer-based means. In several university hospitals a more precise preliminary diagnosis can be made by computer than if a doctor collected the medical history and made his own synopsis. To counteract this dehumanization of practice, medical education will move clinical experience into the first year of medical school, probably placing first-year medical students in community store-front clinics.

Administration, whether business, public or educational, is coming to be viewed as essentially the same, and rooted in the social and behavioral sciences. While it is unlikely that the vested interests of existing education or business schools will yield their independence, newly created universities will develop schools of administration to accommodate a variety of concentrations. And even in existing schools one can predict some form of rapprochement between educational, business and public education.

Engineering may have been more self-critical of its educational effort than most professional schools, and continues this stance with a new study of goals. Despite this body of self-examination, however, it is harder to predict trends for engineering than for other fields. Some see engineering as a graduate program, with the master's as the first professional degree, but others, responsive to practical demands from employers, insist on a four-year bachelor's program with a considerable emphasis on skills.

Education is generally viewed as a growth industry. It is very likely to expand several of its programs in response to clear statements of public policy. By 1980, schools of education will typically offer major programs in pre-school education, compensatory education, educational problems of the central city, and higher education. Since education looms so large in the society's future, institutions which have previously refused to offer work in education are now planning to do so. A few schools of education are planning to devote themselves completely to graduate work, concentrating on research and the preparation of research workers, but the large majority, even in comprehensive universities, anticipate a continuation of teacher and administrator preparation as a major mission.

Other professional fields are also altering, but the big four suggest the dimensions of anticipated change.

The real enigma is the future of undergraduate education. Clearly there is unrest; clearly there is questioning of purposes and goals, and clearly there are significant experiments with new sorts of program--but no pattern seems to be emerging.

In large universities the powers of departmental faculties seem undiminished and are exercised to tailor undergraduate courses to fit the needs of intense specialization. And the departments in smaller schools follow the lead of the major universities. But there is talk of and interest in new sorts of interdisciplinary courses--frequently influenced by the free-university style of course. There is some feeling that specialization, especially in the professional fields, ought to await the graduate years. There is awareness that some kinds of remedial or compensatory education may be required within four-year colleges and universities if they are to serve an even more heterogeneous student body.

The only responsible prediction, however, must be that undergraduate education will experience less change than other sectors. In part, this is because students and faculty in general are reasonably happy with what they are doing and getting. This notion may be shocking in view of the ubiquitous reports of student unrest. But those reports reveal that students are really not protesting about teaching or curricula, although perhaps they should. It is their private lives and some of the moral dilemmas of the entire society that upset them.

Although one cannot be sure of the undergraduate program, it is possible to predict with reasonable assurance the nature and mission of several types of institutions. The large majority of students who receive bachelor's degrees will do so in comprehensive universities. These may be the older, established universities, the newly created ones like those in Florida or New York, or the former normal schools turned state colleges and now state universities. The student mix in some of these may shift toward an ideal of 60 per cent upper-division and graduate, but the number of universities that will reach this by 1980 is limited.

Junior colleges, in spite of apoligists' claims that they will provide lower division work for a majority of those seeking a bachelor's degree, seem destined to serve another mission. By 1980, junior colleges will probably be concentrating on these three functions: Providing some higher education for that segment of the population which previously never aspired to it, providing technical-vocational training leading to immediate employment and providing a great deal of adult education. Regardless of whether such a mission is accepted in theory, it is almost a certainty in practice.

The future shape of private liberal arts colleges is much less clear, although some trends do seem to be emerging. Most of those that survive will double in size during the next dozen years. The 200-odd institutions which presently offer master's programs will be joined by an equal number which see master's work as a means of satisfying faculties and meeting such emerging needs as the preparation of junior college teachers.

Some of the weaker colleges, which previously served a junior college function for students from a limited geographic region, will fail when faced with the competition of public junior colleges. But this number will probably not be large before 1980. After 1980, when the building programs of state higher education systems have been completed and the effects of the declining birth rate effect higher education, a different story may be told. It also seems likely most single-sex institutions will have become coeducational. Some, especially Roman Catholic women's colleges, will serve only one sex, but the trend illustrated by the Vassar-Yale conversations, the Colgate plans, the projected mergers of colleges like St. John's and St. Benedict's, and the Princeton announcement seems reasonably clear and inexorable.

The third area belongs to the students and, while these words may return to haunt, several tendencies seem evident. The first is an increase in the discontinuities of college attendance. There was a time when attending college meant an experience of four consecutive years. The steady 50 per cent dropout rate was assumed to be normal.

Now it appears that in many of the large state universities a graduating class of 30-55 per cent was typical, and that a decade later, 65-70 per cent of that same freshman class have obtained bachelor's degrees from somewhere. Students also seem to be changing types of institutions for financial or other reasons. A family finds four years of high-cost private education too expensive and so allows a child two years at a public and two years at a private institution, with the combination quite optional. Then, too, the Peace Corps, VISTA, and, of course, military service provide increasing options which lead students to interrupt their formal education.

A second trend is implied by students concern over the private sector of their lives. Much of the current protest, and many, if not most, of the complaints on campuses are concerned with institutional infringement on activities that students regard as private. Except in the most custodial institutions there will be a gradual reduction of institutional regulation of student personal conduct. So marked is this trend that institutions should plan residence halls so that coeducational or even cohabitational living will be possibly by the closing decades of this century. Private apartments near campuses already make this a de facto situation. Making such arrangements de jure is merely a question of time. The conditions of urban living which most students will have experienced, the taste of personal freedom between periods of formal education, and a fundamental shift in standards of personal conduct; all these combine to force a new ethic. The only conjectural point is how long individual institutions will resist embracing it.

A third and related facet of the student area concerns their role in governance of the academic or professional functioning of higher education. Again, at the risk of running counter to prevailing opinion, there is little evidence that the vast majority of students want or would accept responsibility for the governance of higher education.

A few older militants demand a voice in all manner of things, from the selection of presidents to determination of the curriculum. But most students are not protesting how the educational part of the college is being run. The students at Berkeley in 1964 were reasonably satisfied with the education they were receiving, and even those who criticize the educational part of their collegiate experience seem to be asking for instant insight, rather than a chance at the hard, grubby work of contriving a curriculum.

One also feels that a number of students who have been demanding a voice in governance are not really full-time students. Rather, a new breed of professional students has emerged. He is somewhat older than average and spends most of his time as a quasi-administration person.

Thus student influence on actual governance is not likely to be greater than it is at present. This prediction may seem moderated by the events in the winter and spring of 1968, when students at Columbia, Stanford, Hampton Institute and San Francisco State slowed those institutions almost to a standstill and apparently gained an important voice in governance. But closer examination of the issues involved and the concessions gained seem to support the evaluation and prediction made here. At Stanford the protest arose over punishment meted to students protesting CIA recruitment on the campus and the concession was greater involvement in student discipline. At Columbia the Viet Nam war and racial problems were involved and again the concessions were more directly related to student discipline and private lives than to academic governance.

The problem of finance, were it not so significant, might better be left until comprehensive basic research has been conducted. But a few observations may be made even now. First, it seems clear that unless new sources of funding are found, virtually every private institution in the country will be involved in deficit financing from 1968-69 on. Some heavily-endowed major institutions will be able to maintain this rate for several years. But less underwritten institutions could follow the University of Pittsburgh's pattern before 1980.

Tax-supported institutions, while in considerably better condition for the future, can also expect serious financial problems, especially since they seek to construct the facilities needed to accommodate anticipated enrollment increases. State and local tax sources are beginning to weaken and one can expect a number of bond election failures and legislative spending curtailments, rather than increased sales income and property taxes. The State of New Hampshire, for example, recently placed its university in a serious situation when the legislature refused to pass either sales or income taxes.

Many schemes have been proposed to solve the financial riddle. Tax rebate plans have the support of some of the small private colleges as well as considerable support in Congress. The full tuition loan, paid back through income tax deductions, seems to be attracting much favorable attention. Institutional grants are favored by a number of universities, but the scheme runs into difficulty when institutional quality becomes involved. Extrapolation from the recent past suggests that the most likely massive form of Federal aid will be some form of direct assistance to students, thus allowing tuition to pay the full cost of instruction.

The fifth area is as sensitive as the financial one, and once again the evidence is unclear. NEA reports indicated acute faculty shortages in the future. But Allan Cartter has speculated that the shortages, although real in the past, will soon be rectified and that by 1980 there could even be a surplus of Ph.D's. If present institutional expectations are realized, there must be acute shortages well into the 1980's, because university leaders expect teaching loads to decrease until a three-hour load is regarded as normal in many institutions.

Further, if junior colleges should attempt to upgrade their faculties to as much as 20-25 per cent Ph.D the shortages could become much more severe. Quite possibly after 1980, the newly-developed Ph.D.-granting institutions plus a stabilized enrollment will create a balance between supply and demand. But until then, the market for college teachers will be reasonably tight. Apparently administrators believe this to be true, because most expect faculty salaries to continue rising at rates of 5.7 per cent a year through at least the early part of the 1970's, and possibly beyond.

The sixth area is that of teaching, and it is here that utopian thinking seems farthest from reality. Utopians see computer-based instruction, multi-media classrooms, automated learning carrels and computerized information-retrieval systems all operating on campus 1980. Indeed, considerable experimentation is being conducted, especially in some of the professional schools. But the typical faculty member in his middle forties in 1967 gives not the slightest impression of entering the wonderful world of new media.

Twenty years have passed since television burst on the cultural scene. And certainly one does find more television being used now than in the 1940's. Still, it is not used widely. If such a simply-adaptable device has taken that long to move into, not the main, but the side stream of education, it seems unlikely that more complicated technology will find any readier acceptance.

# APPENDIX

## TABLE I

### LEVEL OR TYPE OF INSTITUTION FOR WHICH AGENCY HAS PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY

| | Type of Agency | Agency | Public and Private Colleges Universities | Public Colleges Universities | Public Universities and its Branches | Public Colleges | Public Junior Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | M | State Board of Education | | | | 6 * | X |
| | | Individual Boards of Trustees | | | 3 | 1 | |
| * Alaska | B | Board of Regents | | X | | | |
| Arizona | B | Arizona Board of Regents | | | X (3) * | None | |
| | | State Board of Directors for Junior Colleges | | | | | X |
| Arkansas | A | Commission on Coordination of Higher Education Finance | | X | | | |
| California | A | Coordinating Council for Higher Education | X | | | | |
| Colorado | A | Colorado Commission on Higher Education | X | | | | |
| Connecticut | A | Commission for Higher Education | X | | | | |
| Delaware | B | | | | (1) | (1) | |
| Florida | B | Florida Board of Regents | | | X | None | |
| | | State Department of Education - Division of Committees for Junior Colleges | | | | | X |
| Georgia | B | Board of Regents of the University System | | X | | | |
| Hawaii | B | Board of Regents | | X | | None | |
| Idaho | C | State Board of Education | | X | | | |
| Illinois | A | Board of Higher Education | | X | | | |
| Indiana | M | Individual Boards of Trustees | | | (2) | | X |
| | | Indiana State College Board | | | | X (2) | |
| Iowa | B | Board of Regents | | | (2) | (1) | |
| | | State Board of Instruction | | | | | X |
| Kansas | M | Board of Regents | | | U. of Kansas<br>Kansas S. U. | | |
| | | State Board of Public Instruction | | | | | X |
| | | Individual Boards of Trustees | | | (1)<br>Municipal | | |
| Kentucky | A | Council on Public Higher Education | | X | | | |

* Numbers indicate the numbers of institutions of that type under the agency's control.
A number in parenthesis indicates the total number of institutions of that type in the state.

## TABLE I (continued)

## LEVEL OR TYPE OF INSTITUTION FOR WHICH AGENCY HAS PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY

|  | Type of Agency | Agency | Public and Private Colleges Universities | Public Colleges Universities | Public Universities and its Branches | Public Colleges | Public Junior Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ouisiana | M | Louisiana State University Board of Regents |  |  | X |  |  |
|  |  | State Board of Education |  |  |  | X | X 2 |
| aine | M | State Board of Education |  |  |  | 5 Coll.<br>4 Vo-Tech Inst. | None |
|  |  | Individual Board |  |  | X |  |  |
| aryland | A | Advisory Council for Higher Education |  | X |  |  |  |
| assachusetts | A | Board of Higher Education |  | X |  |  |  |
| ichigan | C | Department of Education of the State Board of Education |  | X |  |  |  |
| innesota | A | Higher Education Coordinating Commission | X |  |  |  |  |
| ississippi | B | Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning |  |  | X | X |  |
|  |  | Junior College Commission |  |  |  |  | X |
| issouri | A | Commission on Higher Education |  | X |  |  |  |
| ontana | C | Board of Education |  |  | X | X |  |
|  |  | Local Boards |  |  |  |  | (2) |
| ebraska | M | University of Nebraska Regents |  |  | (1) |  |  |
|  |  | University of Omaha Regents |  |  | (1) |  |  |
|  |  | Strustees of the State Normal Schools |  |  |  | X |  |
|  |  | Local Boards |  |  |  |  | (5) receive no state aid |
|  |  | Co-ordinating Commission on Higher Education<br>2 - except for two year branches under LSU Board |  | Voluntary association of public institutions |  |  |  |

## TABLE I (continued)

## LEVEL OR TYPE OF INSTITUTION FOR WHICH AGENCY HAS PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY

| | Type of Agency | Agency | Public and Private Colleges Universities | Public Colleges Universities | Public Universities and its Branches | Public Colleges | Public Junior Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nevada | B | Board of Regents | | (1) | | | |
| New Hampshire | B | Trustees - University of New Hampshire | | | X | X | |
| | | State Board of Education | | | | | (1)<br>Voc-Tech Institute |
| New Jersey | A | Board of Higher Education | X | | | | |
| New Mexico | A | Board of Educational Finance | | X | | | |
| New York | A | The University of the State of New York (Board of Regents) | X | | | | |
| North Carolina | A | Board of Higher Education | X | | | | |
| | | Board of Education | | | | | X |
| North Dakota | A | State Board of Higher Education | | X | | | |
| Ohio | A | Board of Regents | | X | | | |
| Oklahoma | A | State Regents for Higher Education | | X | | | |
| Oregon | A | Educational Coordinating Council | | X | | | |
| Pennsylvania | C | State Board of Education | | X | | | |
| | | With Council for Higher Education Responsibile to it | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | B | Board of Trustees of State Colleges | | X | | | |
| South Carolina | A | State Commission on Higher Education | | X | | | |
| South Dakota | A | Commission on Higher Educational Facilities | X | | | | |
| Tennessee | A | No data | | | | | |
| Texas | A | Coordinating Board, Texas Colleges and Universities System | | X | | | |

## TABLE I (continued)

### LEVEL OR TYPE OF INSTITUTION FOR WHICH AGENCY HAS PLANNING RESPONSIBILITY

| | Type of Agency | Agency | Public and Private Colleges Universities | Public Colleges Universities | Public Universities and its Branches | Public Colleges | Public Junior Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Utah | A | Coordinating Council of Higher Education | | X | | | |
| Vermont | M | University of Vermont | | | X | | |
| | | Vermont State Colleges | | | | X | (1)<br>Technical |
| Virginia | A | State Council of Higher Education | | X | | | |
| Washington | M | Separate Institution Boards | | | X | X | |
| | | State Board for Community Colleges | | | | | X |
| West Virginia | N | Commission on Higher Education | Conducts Studies: Advisory Only | | | | |
| Wisconsin | A | Coordinating Committee for Higher Education | | X | | | |
| Wyoming | B | University of Wyoming | | | X | | |
| | | Wyoming Community College Commission | | | | | (6) |

CODE FOR TYPE OF AGENCY:

A - States with a Central Planning Agency
B - States in which a single Board both Governs and Plans
C - States where the State Board of Education has Planning Responsibility
M - States with Multiple Boards
N - Not Classified

## TABLE II[1]

| TYPE-STATE | No. of Public Institutions | | Year Board Created | No. of Professional Staff[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sr. | Jr. | | |
| I. AGENCIES HAVING STATE-WIDE RESPONSIBILITIES | | | | |
| 1.1 Consolidated State-wide Governing Board | | | | |
| Alaska | 1 | 6 | 1935 | -[b] |
| Arizona | 3 | - | 1945 | 9 |
| Delaware | 2 | | | |
| Florida | 5 | 24[c] | 1905 | 16 |
| Georgia | 12 | 12 | 1931 | 16 |
| Hawaii | 1 | - | | |
| Iowa | 3 | 16 | 1909 | 3 |
| Kansas | 7 | 16[c] | 1913 | 2 |
| Mississippi | 8 | 17[c] | 1910 | 7 |
| Nevada | 2 | - | 1864 | 1 |
| New Hampshire | 3 | 3 | 1963 | -[d] |
| North Dakota | 6 | 6 | 1911 | 3 |
| Oregon | 7 | 8[c] | 1929 | 30 |
| Rhode Island | 2 | 1 | 1939 | 2 |
| South Dakota | 7 | - | 1897 | 2 |
| 1.2 Coordinating Board | | | | |
| Arkansas* | 8 | 3 | 1961 | 5 |
| California | 26 | 75 | 1960 | 17 |
| Colorado* | 10 | 9[c] | 1965 | 3 |
| Connecticut | 5 | 11 | 1965 | 2 |
| Illinois | 12 | 27 | 1961 | 9 |
| Kentucky+ | 6 | 9 | 1934 | 3 |
| Maryland* | 7 | 12 | 1963 | 3 |
| Massachusetts | 15 | 11 | 1965 | -[d] |
| Minnesota | 9 | 14 | 1966 | 2 |
| Missouri | 10 | 9 | 1963 | 3 |
| New Jersey | 8 | 1 | 1967 | -[f] |
| New Mexico* | 6 | 7 | 1951 | 3 |
| North Carolina | 16 | 13[c] | 1955 | 5 |
| Ohio* | 10 | 36 | 1963 | 7 |
| Oklahoma* | 11 | 7 | 1941 | 6 |
| South Carolina | 5 | 7 | 1962 | -[f] |
| Tennessee* | 7 | - | 1967 | -[f] |
| Texas* | 22 | 34 | 1955 | 20 |
| Utah | 4 | 3 | 1959 | 4 |
| Virginia* | 12 | 12 | 1956 | 6 |
| Wisconsin | 10 | 23 | 1955 | 6 |

*Indicates all-public board[e]
+Institutional members non-voting.

---

[1] Robert O. Berdahl, The State Planning and Coordinating Agencies for Higher Education, August, 1967 (unpublished manuscript).

## TABLE II
(continued)

| TYPE-STATE | No. of Public Institutions | | Year Board Created | No. of Professional Staff[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sr. | Jr. | | |
| **II. STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION** | | | | |
| Idaho | 4 | 2 | 1912 | -[d] |
| Michigan | 11 | 20 | 1964 | 10 |
| Montana | 6 | - | 1889 | 3 |
| New York | 25 | 34 | 1784 | -[d] |
| Pennsylvania | 15 | 4 | 1963 | -[d] |
| **III. VOLUNTARY OR NO STATE-WIDE COORDINATION** | | | | |
| **3.1 Voluntary** | | | | |
| Indiana | 4 | 10 | 1951 | |
| Nebraska | 6 | 4 | 1966 | |
| Washington | 5 | 14 | 1961 | |
| **3.2 No Board Coordination** | | | | |
| Alabama | 10 | 1 | | |
| Louisiana | 10 | - | | |
| Maine | 7 | - | | |
| Vermont | 4 | 1 | | |
| West Virginia | 10 | 1 | | |
| Wyoming | 1 | 5 | | |

---

[a] excludes secretarial and clerical staff

[b] staff provided by the University of Alaska

[c] Junior institutions not included in coordinating agency jurisdiction

[d] information not available

[e] all-public board means persons chosen to represent the public rather than the institutions. Some institutions have trustees elected by the public and would claim "public" status for them as well. But in this report we shall use the word in the former sense.

[f] boards too new for data to be available

## TABLE III

### Degree of Planning By State

| | Master Plan | Quasi-* Plan | Study | Plan Being Developed | Different Plans According to Level or Type | No Plan or Study |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | | | | | | X |
| Alaska | | | X | | | |
| Arizona | | X | | | | |
| Arkansas | | | | X | | |
| California | X | | | | | |
| Colorado | | X | | | | |
| Connecticut | | | X | | | |
| Delaware | | | | | X | |
| Florida | X | | | | | |
| Georgia | | | | | | X |
| Hawaii | | | X | | | |
| Idaho | | | | | | X |
| Illinois | X | | | | | |
| Indiana | | | X | | | |
| Iowa | | | X | | | |
| Kansas | | | X | | | |
| Kentucky | | X | | | | |
| Louisiana | | | | | | X |
| Maine | | | X | | | |
| Maryland | | | | X | | |
| Massachusetts | X | | | | | |
| Michigan | | | | X | | |
| Minnesota | | | | X | | |
| Mississippi | X | | | | | |
| Missouri | X | | | | | |

## TABLE III
(continued)

| | Master Plan | Quasi-* Plan | Study | Plan Being Developed | Different Plans According to Level or Type | No Plan or Study |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Montana | X | | | | | |
| Nebraska | | | | | | X |
| Nevada | | | | | | X |
| New Hampshire | | | | | | X |
| New Jersey | | | | X | | |
| New Mexico | | X | | | | |
| New York | X | | | | | |
| North Carolina | | | | X | | |
| North Dakota | | | | X | | |
| Ohio | X | | | | | |
| Oklahoma | | | X | X | | |
| Oregon | | X | | | | |
| Pennsylvania | X | | | | | |
| Rhode Island | | | X | | | |
| South Carolina | | | | X | | |
| South Dakota | | | | | | X |
| Tennessee | | | | X | | |
| Texas | | | | X | | |
| Utah | | | | X | | |
| Vermont | | | | | | X |
| Virginia | | | | X | | |
| Washington | | | | | | X |
| West Virginia | | | | | | X |
| Wisconsin | X | | | | | |
| Wyoming | | | | | | X |

*While no single document or no designated master plan, studies and reports substantially equal a master plan, many parts of which may have been been implemented.

TABLE IV

STATES WITH A CENTRAL PLANNING AGENCY - COMPOSITION OF THE AGENCY MEMBERSHIP

| | Size of Board | Governor Appointed | By Virtue of Their Position | Elected by Their Own Body | Elected by Legislature | Term of Office in Years | Representatives from public Universities | Public 4 year College | Public 2 year Colleges | Private Colleges Universities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 10 | 10 | | | | 10 | T K | T K | | |
| California | 18 | 6 | | | | 4 | | | | |
| | | 3 | | | | 4 | | | | 3 |
| | | | 2 E | 4 T | | 1 | 1 E 2 T | 1E 2T | | |
| | | | | 3 | | 4 | | | 1E 1T | |
| Colorado | 7 | 7 | | | | 4 | K | K | K | |
| Connecticut | 16 | 12 | | | | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | 4 | | 2 | 1 T | 1 T | 1 T | |
| Illinois | 13 | 8 | | | | 6 | | | | |
| | | | 5 | | | | 2 T | 1 T | 1 T | |
| Kentucky | 9 | 9 | | | | 4 | K | K | K | K |
| Maryland | 9 | 9 | | | | 6 | | | | |
| Massachusetts | 11 | 7 | | | | 5 | | | | 1 T |
| | | | | 4 | | 1 | 1 T | 1 T | 1 T | *** |
| | *** Plus 1T from Lowell Technology Institute or South-East Massachusetts Technology Institute (alternate year | | | | | | | | | |
| Minnesota | No Data | | | | | | | | | |
| Missouri | 10 | 6 | | | | 6 | K | K | K | K |
| | | 4 | | | | 6 | 1 E | 1 E | 1 E | 1 E |
| New Jersey | 15 | 9 | | | | 6 | | | | |
| | | | 5 | | | | 1ET | 2ET | 1ET | |
| | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 |
| New Mexico | 9 | 9 | | | | 6 | | (9) One each judicial district | | |
| New York | 14 | | | | 14 | 14 | | | | |
| North Carolina | 15 | 9 | | | | 6 | | | | |

E - Refers to chief executive officer
T - Refers to Board of Trustees
K - Ineligible to Serve

## TABLE IV
(Continued)

## STATES WITH A CENTRAL PLANNING AGENCY - COMPOSITION OF THE AGENCY MEMBERSHIP

| | Size of Board | Governor Appointed | By Virtue of Their Position | Elected by Their Own Body | Elected by Legislature | Term of Office in Years | Representatives from public Universities | Public 4 year College | Public 2 year College | Private Colleges Universities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| North Carolina | | | - | 6 | | 2 | 2 T | 4 T | | |
| North Dakota | 7 | 7 | | | | 7 | | | | |
| Ohio | 9 | 9 | | | | 9 | | | | |
| Oklahoma | 9 | 9 | | | | 9 | K | K | K | |
| Oregon | Government Decides | X | | | | Government Decides | X | X | X | X |
| South Carolina | 7 | 7 | | | | 4 | K | K | K | |
| | | | | | | | Plus a trustee from each state supported institution, ex-official | | | |
| South Dakota | No | Data | | | | | | | | |
| Tennessee | No | Data | | | | | | | | |
| Texas | 18 | 18 | | | | 6 | Professionally employed educators ineligible | | | |
| Utah | 9 | 6 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 3 | | | 1 T | 1 T | | |
| Virginia | 9 | 8 | | | | 4 | K | K | K | K |
| | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Wisconsin | 17 | 9 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 5 | | | | 1ET | 2ET | | |
| | | | | 3 | | | 1 T | 1 T | | |

E - Refers to chief executive officer
T - Refers to Board of Trustees
K - Ineligible to Serve

## TABLE V

## STATES WITH A MASTER PLAN

## ASSUMPTIONS ON WHICH PLAN IS BASED

| | Total Population | College Age Population | School Age Population | Industrialization | Per Capita Income | Education Level of Population | % High School Graduates Attending College | In-Migration | Out-Migration |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arizona | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| California | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Colorado | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Florida | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Illinois | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Kentucky | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C | C |
| Mississippi | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Missouri | 2 E | 2 E | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 F | 1 | 1 |
| Montana | 2 E | 2 E | 2 E | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| New Mexico | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 E | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 E | C |
| New York | 2 | 2 F | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 F | 1 K | 1 K |
| Ohio | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Oregon | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C | C |
| Pennsylvania | 2 E | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | C | C |
| Wisconsin | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

A - At some of the Commonwealth Institutions
B - By design
C - No assumption made
D - No tuition charged - No assumption of change
E - Increase expected is slight and perhaps stabilizing
F - Sizable growth expected
H - As cost of instruction increases
K - Percentage will remain stable
M - Regents seem to favor 2 tuition charge at CUNY

CODE:
1. Stable
2. Growing
3. Declining

## TABLE VI

## STATES WITH A CENTRAL PLANNING AGENCY - COMPOSITION OF THE AGENCY MEMBERSHIP

| | Lay Citizens | Women | Labor | Representatives of single Political Party | State Board Education | Advisory Committee Representatives Higher Education |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | | | | | | |
| California | 6 | | | | | |
| | | | | | 1 | |
| Colorado | 7 | | | 4 Max | K | X |
| Connecticut | | | | | | X |
| | | | | | 1 | |
| Illinois | 8 | | | | | |
| | | | | | 1 | |
| Kentucky | 9 | | | | K | |
| Maryland | | | | | | |
| Massachusetts | | 2 | 1 | | | X |
| Minnesota | | | | | | |
| Missouri | 6 | | | 3 Max | K | X |
| New Jersey | 9 | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | | Pres. | |
| New Mexico | | | | 5 Max | | |
| New York | 14 | | | | | |
| North Carolina | 8 | | | | 1 | X |

TABLE VI
(Continued)

STATES WITH A CENTRAL PLANNING AGENCY - COMPOSITION OF THE AGENCY MEMBERSHIP

| | Lay Citizens | Women | Labor | Representatives of single Political Party | State Board Education | Advisory Committee Representatives Higher Education |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| North Carolina | 8 | | | | 1 | X |
| North Dakota | | | | | | |
| Ohio | | | | | | |
| Oklahoma | 9 | | | | K | |
| Oregon | Majority | | | | | |
| South Carolina | | | | | K | X |
| South Dakota | No | Data | | | | |
| Tennessee | No | Data | | | | |
| Texas | | | | | | |
| Utah | | | | | | |
| Virginia | | | | | 1 | |
| Wisconsin | 9 | | | | 1 E | |
| | ** 1E Vocational Educational Board | | | | 1 E | |
| | ** 1T Vocational Educational Board | | | | | |

## TABLE VII

### STATES WITH A MASTER PLAN

### SCOPE AND SPECIFICITY OF THE PLAN

| | Number of Institutions | Responsibility of types of Institutions | Financing new Facilities | Size of Institution | Source of Operating Support | Entrance Requirements | Type of Curricula by Institution | Faculty Salaries | Use of ne Media |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arizona | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| California | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Colorado | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Florida | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Illinois | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Kentucky | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Missouri | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Montana | 4 A | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| New Mexico | 2 B | 4 | 4 | C | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| New York | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Ohio | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Oregon | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

A - No branch campuses, new or experimental institutions are contemplated.
No changes in the present system in law or practice are expected.
B - Except for two or three local two-year colleges, assumption is no expansion
C - Situation does not require a statement
D - Tuition remitted for children of disabled veterans or those killed as result of war.

CODE:

1. Makes no statement
2. Indicates broad policy only
3. Makes specific recommendation but does not identify responsible agency
4. Recommends specific policy and specific responsible agency

TABLE VII
(Continued)

STATES WITH A MASTER PLAN

SCOPE AND SPECIFICITY OF THE PLAN

| | Student Financial Aid | Branch Campuses | Location of new Institutions | Governance of state System | Cooperation between Public and Private Institution | Experimental Colleges | Degrees by type Institution | Continuous State Planning | Constitutional Status of Institution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arizona | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| California | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Colorado | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Florida | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Illinois | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Kentucky | 1 D | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Massachusetts | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| Missouri | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Montana | 4 | 4 A | 4 A | 4 A | 2 | 4 A | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| New Mexico | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| New York | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| Ohio | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Oregon | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| Pennsylvania | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Wisconsin | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

A - No branch campuses, new or experimental institutions are contemplated.
No changes in the present system in law or practice are expected.
B - Except for two or three local two-year colleges, assumption is no expansion
C - Situation does not require a statement
D - Tuition remitted for children of disabled veterans or those killed as result of war.

CODE:
1. Makes no statement
2. Indicates broad policy only
3. Makes specific recommendation but does not identify responsible agency
4. Recommends specific policy and specific responsible agency

# TABLE VIII

## STATES WITH A CENTRAL PLANNING AGENCY

Inter-relationships Between the Central Agency and Other Planning Groups

| | Public 4 year Univ | Public 4 year Colleges | Public 2 year Colleges | Private Colleges Univ | State H.E.F.A. Board | State Planning Board | State Dept Ed | State Dept Finance | Assoc Private Colleges Univ | Regional Boards | Consul tants | Regional Office H.E.W. | Federally Supported Research Lab |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | | | | | 3 | | | |
| California | 1E** | 1E** | 1 | 3 | | | E | 6 E | | 8 | 4 | | |
| Colorado | 1E** | 1E** | 3 | | | | | | B | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Connecticut | 1BE** | 1BE** | 1BE** | 3. 7. B | | | E | | 3 E | 3 | 4 | | |
| Illinois | 1A | 1A | 1 6 AE** | A | | | 6 | | 3 E | 3 | 8 | | |
| Kentucky | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 B | 1 E | | | | 3 E | 2. 4. | | | |
| Maryland | 5E** | 5E** | 5 | B | 5 E | 5E | 5E | 5 E | | 3 | | | |
| Massachusetts | AB | AB | A | 8 B | E | | | | | 8 E | 4 | | |
| Minnesota | 5A | 5A | 5A | 5 A | | 6E | | | 3 | 8 | | | |
| Missouri | 5AB | 5AB | 2AB*** | 3 AB | | | BE | | 3E | 3 | 8 | | |
| New Jersey | 1A7 | 1A7 | 1A7 | 1A7 | 2 | | 1A | | A | | 8 | | |
| New Mexico | 1C | 1C | 2C | 3C | 2 | | | | | 3 | 8 | | |
| New York | 1C | 1C | 1C | 1C | 2 | | # | | | | 4 | | |
| North Carolina | 1A | 1A | 8D | 1 | E | E | E | | 3E | 3. 4.D | | | E |
| North Dakota | 2 | 2 | 5D | 3 | AE | | | | | A | | | |
| Ohio | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | | | | 8 | 8 | | |
| Oklahoma | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | E | | | | | 3. 4. | 8 | | |
| Oregon | 1AE** | 1AE** | 1AE** | 5 | | | 6AE | E | 3E | 3 | | | |
| South Carolina | 1A | 1A | 1A | 3 | | | | 5 | E | 3D | 4 | | D |
| South Dakota | E** | E** | | 3 | | E | | | 8 | 8 | 8 | | |
| Tennessee | NO | DATA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Texas | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | | E | 3 | | | 3 | |
| Utah | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 6E | | | 8 | 3 | 8 | | |
| Virginia | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | E | | | 3E | 3 | | | 3E |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3A | AE | | | | | 8 | 8 | | |

Legend

Codes A (ex officio) and E with Advisory Council on Education

* Applies to the system wide governing board for these institutions

** Shares Responsibility with State Education Department

*** Serves as the administrative arm

See attached code sheet.

## TABLE VIII
(Continued)

## CODE FOR INTER-RELATIONSHIPS OF PRIMARY PLANNING AGENCY WITH OTHER PLANNING GROUPS

1. Coordinates - has legal responsibility to bring about concerted and common action

2. Has legal responsibility for - is the primary state level agency concerned with both coordination and institutional supervision

3. Maintains, or receives from, voluntary cooperation and consultation

4. Contractual

5. Advises and recommends - does not have the authority to coordinate

6. Frequent formal consultation - characterizes the relationship between the agency and some other state agency with major planning responsibility. Lacks the authority of coordination but is more formal and mandatory than voluntary cooperation and consultation

7. Has a licensing and/or accrediting function

8. None, or usually none

A. Has at least one member in common with the other agency

B. Uses representatives of the other agency on advisory or study committees

C. No overlapping membership with other agencies

D. Members of the PRIMARY agency serve on the board or advisory committee of the other agency

E. The other agency also influences the PRIMARY agency's planning

## TABLE IX

### States in Which the State Board of Education is the Responsible Planning Agency

| | Identify Educ Needs Of State | Needed Changes in Struct of H.E. | Approve Instit Expansion Plans | Approve Plan, Location, Cost of New Instit | Define Role & Scope | Approve Operations of Individ Instit | Conduct Continuing Studies |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Idaho | 3 A | 3 A | 4 B** | 4 B** | 3 A | 4 A | 4 A |
| Michigan | 1 C | 1 C | 3 C | 3 C | 3 C | 3 C | 1 C |
| Montana | 4 C | 4 C | 4 C | 4 C | 4 B | 4 B | 4 B |
| Pennsylvania | 3 A | 3 A | | | 3 A | 3 A | 3 A |

**Legend**

1. Coordinates - has legal responsibility to bring about concerted and common action
2. Has legal responsibility for - is the primary state level agency concerned with both coordination and institutional supervision
3. Maintains, or receives from, voluntary cooperation and consultation
4. Contractual

A. Has at least one member in common with the other agency

B. Uses representatives of the other agency on advisory or study committees

C. No overlapping membership with other agencies

D. Members of the PRIMARY agency serve on the board or advisory committee of the other agency

E. The other agency also influences the PRIMARY agency's planning

## TABLE X

### STATES IN WHICH THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION IS THE RESPONSIBLE PLANNING AGENCY

Inter-relationships With Other Planning Groups

| | Public 4 year Univ | Public 4 year Colleges | Public 2 year Colleges | Private Colleges Univ | State H.E.F.A. Board | State Planning Board | State Dept Ed | State Dept Finance | Assoc Private Colleges Univ | Regional Boards | Consultants | Regional Office H.E.W. | Federall Supporte Research Lab |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Idaho | 2 | 2 | 1 | B | A* | | | | | 3 | | | |
| Michigan | 1 | 1 | D | B | | | | 3E | | | | | |
| Montana | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | AE | | | | | 4 | | | |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | | | | | | 4 | | |

* The State Board of Education, plus one additional member, is the Idaho Commission for Higher Education Facilities.

## TABLE XI

## ASSOCIATIONS OF SMALL NUMBERS OF INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS

| PURPOSE | EXAMPLE |
|---|---|
| Inter-university faculty planning board or council (nursing, etc.) | New England Council for Higher Education in Nursing (NECHEN) of the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE) |
| Complementary teaching, research, and services | Atlanta University Center |
| Developing Institutions Programs | University of Oklahoma<br>Oklahoma Baptist University |
| Joint activities under state/or Federal aegis | Oak Ridge National Labs. |
| Joint programs: in extension programs (on a campus or all campuses or ext. center), classes, research seminars (for students or faculty), summer sessions; rare, expensive, exotic, unique or rapidly changing academic or administrative areas | Linguistic Institute of America, West Va. University and Morris Harvey<br>College Extension Program of Central Michigan Univ., Eastern Mich.Univ., Michigan State Univ., Univ. of Michigan, Wayne State University |
| Advisory or operating boards for laboratories, museums, etc. | Associated Universities, Inc. (for Brookhaven National Laboratories) |
| Joint professorships | Yale and Wesleyan University in Political Science and Astronomy |
| Exchange professorships | Macalester College and University of Minnesota |
| Visiting lectureships | Tuskegee and University of Michigan, Univ. of Kansas, Univ. of Nebraska, Univ. of Oklahoma and Kansas State Univ. |
| Adjunct professors from the professions, business, and industry, including research laboratories of industry | Graduate Research Center of the Southwest and Southern Methodist University |
| Appointments of staff or consultants | Claremont Colleges |
| Coordinating council for church-related or other college systems | (Adventist, Baptist, Catholic, etc.) |
| Cooperative administration (in fund-raising, recruitment, etc.) | New England College Fund |

## TABLE XI
(Continued)

## ASSOCIATIONS OF SMALL NUMBERS OF INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS

| PURPOSE | EXAMPLE |
|---|---|
| Interchange of Classes (often without additional registration or tuition) | Skidmore College and Union College |
| Interchange of credits | Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area |
| Joint degrees | Missouri University and Ohio State University (Ph.D), Cascade College, George Fox College, Oregon College of Education, Southern Oregon College (MA) |
| Combination courses | University of Chicago, MA in Humanities, California Institute of Technology in Combined Engineering Plan, Duke MA in Forestry |
| Freedom of facilities (Library, Laboratories, etc.) | Brown and the University of Rhode Island (Library), Scarritt, George Peabody and Vanderbilt University |
| Traveling scholar programs | CIC; Committee on Travel Grants |
| Joint student-faculty leadership convocation | The Claremont Colleges |
| Interchange for children of faculty | Institutions of the CIC (Indiana, Michigan, etc.) |
| Cross Registration | Drexel and the University of Pennsylvania, Boston University and The Episcopal Theological School, Harvard, MIT, and Tufts. |
| Student Exchange | Bilateral: Bowling Green State University, University of Toledo |
| Joint use or sharing of laboratories and other campus or research facilities | Users of MIT Computer Facilities |
| Joint operations or use of major academic facilities institutional, industrial and government, local, regional and national | Kansas State University, University of Kansas |

## TABLE XI
(Continued)

### ASSOCIATIONS OF SMALL NUMBERS OF INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS

| PURPOSE | EXAMPLE |
|---|---|
| Joint libraries, unique or esoteric collections and knowledge storage retrieval and communication facilities | Library Council: Kansas State College, Fort Hays and Pittsburgh, Kansas State College, Wichita State University, University of Kansas, Kansas State University; Data Network: Western Data Processing Center--100 institutions |
| Joint ETV and Audio visual facilities, including exchange of tapes, video cartridges, etc., to supplement the professor in classroom or lab | Communications Council 27 universities |
| Cooperative centers for classrooms, offices, laboratories, administrative functions, meetings, etc. | College Center of the Finger Lakes |
| Clustering of colleges or professional schools around distinguished universities or other key institutions. Museums, galleries, churches, hospitals, etc. | Medical Teaching and Research |
| Joint maintenance and operating program of basic physical plant, and facilities for food, health, recreation entertainment, athletics, museums, library, etc. | George Peabody College and Scarritt College |
| Interuniversity facilities commission | State Coordinating Boards |
| Publishing: Monographs, calendars, etc. | College and University Reports |
| Regional Continuation Education Centers | Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, and other Kellogg-funded centers |
| Field Stations, laboratories, etc. | NSF Field Camp, Wisconsin |
| SERVICES OF INFORMATION INTERCHANGE* | |
| International education, coordination and planning | International Activities, Inc.; Regional Council for International Education |
| Financial accounting and reports | The Claremont Colleges |

---

*In this study services and information were found to so generally overlap the staff, student and facilities interchanges that in order to avoid confusion in responses, the questionnaire was restricted to the latter three areas.

## TABLE XI
(Continued)

## ASSOCIATIONS OF SMALL NUMBERS OF INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS

| PURPOSE | EXAMPLE |
|---|---|
| Admissions, grade accounting and reports | University of Denver and Colorado Women's College |
| Institutional Research (Records, Statistics, Computer Services) | Ball State University and Tri-State College |
| Citizens committees and organizations for city redevelopment | Center for Urban Education |
| Consulting and coordination of local or regional or national planning, building, operation maintenance, financial records, food service, budgeting, including uniform or standardized forms or procedures where desirable | Regional Compacts: SREB, WICHE, NEBHE |
| Broadening of Inter-library Loan Services | Area Library Cooperative Program |
| Faculty retirement | Atlanta University Center |
| Faculty and student recruitment, placement, etc. | Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges |
| Computer (and eventually laser) or other networks | Medical Library TWX Network |
| Public-relations and information services, insurance-health, life, fire, etc. | American College Public Relations Association and College and Univ. Reports |
| Alumni council activities: Editorial Projects for Education Inc. | Serving over 350 schools |
| Fund raising | Michigan Colleges Foundation, Inc. |
| Student services (Counseling, Testing, Health, etc.) | College Student Personnel Institute, The Claremont Colleges |
| Continuation education, city or county-wide | Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education |
| Scientific and Cultural exhibitions and programs (Speakers, Art and Sculpture exhibitions, films, music, performing arts, etc.) | Atlanta University Center, Claremont Colleges |
| Specialized professional services as by schools for the deaf, cerebral palsy clinics, museum, seminars, industry | University of So. California and John Tracy Clinic |
| Statewide coordination by state higher education boards | Coordinating Board of Texas |

TABLE XII

STATE ASSOCIATIONS OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES A

| State | Organized | Member Qual. | Inc. | Folder listing Members | Annual Dues | Office | Staff |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| California | Yes, about 1955 | Accredited, 4-year liberal arts | Yes | Yes, also 60-page Guidebook | Enrollment, 82.5¢ per student (full-time plus full-time equivalent), graduate and undergraduate | Los Angeles | Full-time Director and secy. |
| Colorado | Yes, 1964 | Accredited 4-year inst. | Yes | No, but planned | Enrollment plus min. base | Denver | Full-time Director |
| Connecticut | Yes, 1966 as presently constituted | Accreditation | Not as yet | A brochure | Enrollment. Minimum $100 | Hartford | Part-time Exec. Dir. and full-time secy. |
| Florida | Yes, 1964 | Accredited 4 yr. inst. | Yes | Yes | $175.00 per month | St. Petersburg | Uses a P.R firm in li of Exec. Dir. A par time secy. |
| Illinois | Yes, 1904 | Privately supported and accredited | Yes | Yes | Enrollment with a minimum | Chicago | Full-time director and secy. |
| Indiana | No. Functions performed through Assoc. Colleges of Indiana and Assn. of Church-related and Ind. Colleges | | | | | Indianapolis (uses Assoc. Col. of Indiana office) | Uses A.C.I staff |
| Iowa | Yes 1962-63 | Accreditation | Yes | Yes | $500 plus 50¢ per student | Des Moines | Full-time director a secretary |
| Kansas | Yes, 1960 Church-Related Colleges | Accreditation | No | No | Assessment on basis of adopted prog. | No | Elected fr membership |
| Kentucky | Yes, 1965 | Regional accreditation or recognition by State Dept. of Education | Yes, 1966 | | Probably minimum plus enrollment | Louisville | Part-time dir. and part-time secy. |
| Massachusetts | Yes, May 1967 | Non-profit, private colleges and universities | No | Membership listed | Enrollment--graduated dues schedule | Address officers | Part-time Director, full-time secretary |
| Michigan | Yes, March '67 | Somewhat broader than accreditation | Yes | Hope to publish | Based on enrollment maximum of 3000 for dues purposes | Lansing | Full-time Director and secretary |

TABLE XII

INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

| Office | Staff | Legis. Counsel | Board Members | Meetings | Where | Committees |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Los Angeles | Full-time Director and secy. | Yes, on retainer plus fees for extra assignments | The Presidents, plus 1 Trustee, plus 1 other (usually bus. Mgr. or dean) | 2 regular; others on call if needed | 1 North, 1 South | Exec., Nominating, Scholarship & Loan, Finance (Budget), Gov. Relations, Com. on Role of Private Higher Educ., Personnel Practices, Gift Solicitation by Pub. Inst. Com. on New Private Inst., Com. on State Associations |
| Denver | Full-time Director | None on retainer | Pres., Trustees, Dean, or Bus. Mgr., including faculty | 2 regular; others on call | Usually in Denver | Later |
| Hartford | Part-time Exec. Dir. and full-time secy. | Will determine as needed | Presidents and others such as dean or bus. mgr. | 2 regular; others on call | Different places | Executive |
| St. Petersburg | Uses a P.R. firm in lieu of Exec. Dir. A part-time secy. | No retainer | Presidents only | 5 regular; others on call | Different places | Ad hoc only |
| Chicago | Full-time director and secy. | No | Presidents only | 1, on call | Different places | Exec. and Legis. |
| Indianapolis (uses Assoc. Col. of Indiana office) | Uses A.C.I. staff | On ad hoc basis | | | | |
| Des Moines | Full-time director and secretary | Yes, for specific assignments | Presidents only | 1 regular; 2 or 3 on call | Different places | Exec., Legis., Budget and Finance, Public Relations |
| No | Elected from membership | Yes, for specific tasks | Presidents only | 1 regular; others on call | Different places by agreement | On legislative matters |
| Louisville | Part-time dir. and part-time secy. | None | Presidents only | On call | Different places | Scholarship to develop Loan-Scholarship reimbursement of tuition. |
| Address officers | Part-time Director, full-time secretary | No | Presidents only | Annual and on call | So far in Boston area | Executive Committee and Nominating |
| Lansing | Full-time Director and secretary | Yes, partially on retainer | Presidents only | Board, semi-annual and | Usually Lansing | |

TABLE XII (Continued)

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minnesota | Yes, Jan. 1935. Presently reorganizing for greater activity | 4-year accredited; liberal arts oriented | No | No | Annual assessment equally divided to cover budget approved in advance | Minneapolis | Exec. Dir. Minn. Priv Coll. Func plus Assoc Dir. for Council Activities |
| Missouri | Yes, 1893 | Fully accredited 2-year or 4-year | No | News Bulletins list members | $200 base fee, plus 50¢ for each F.T.E. undergraduate | St. Louis | Part-time director S secretary, but trend toward ful time direc and secy. |
| Nebraska | No, but organization anticipated in 1968 | | | | | | |
| New Jersey | Yes, April '66 | Accreditation 2 or 4 years | Yes | Not yet | 50¢ per student (no minimum) | Office of Assn. Pres. | No special director c secy. |
| New York | Yes, 1906 | Chartered degree granting | No | Yes | Enrollment (full-time). Graduated assessment $350-$850 | Albany | Full-time Director a secretary |
| Ohio | No, but possibility has been under some consideration. Have Liaison Commission for Independent Colleges of Ohio of Board of Regents | | | | | | |
| Oregon | Yes, Dec. 1960 | Accreditation | Yes, Dec. 1960 | No | None | Voluntary assistance b Exec. Dir. of Ore. Col lege Found. and secy. for records, minutes, meeting arrangements | |
| Pennsylvania | Yes, about 1960 | Accreditation | No | Listed on Letterhead | Enrollment | Harrisburg | Half-time President, full-time secretary |
| South Carolina | In process now | Accreditation 2 or 4-year institutions | Yes | Plan to publish | Minimum flat fee | Greenville | Part-time secretary |
| Texas | Yes, April 1965 | Accreditation | Yes | Not as yet | | | Voluntary officers. No full or part-time staff |
| Washington | No organization | | | | | | |
| Wisconsin | 1961 from an earlier loose association | 4-year liberal arts colleges | No | Not yet | Assessments established yearly; 60% equally; 40% by enrollment | Madison | Full-time Director |

BLE XII (Continued)

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Minneapolis | Exec. Dir. Minn. Priv. Coll. Fund plus Assoc. Dir. for Council Activities | None at present | Presidents (probable provision for a substitute in unusual circumstances and with approval of Exec. Com.) | Annual and on call | | Probably organized later. Might have one organization for legislative matters and another for cooperative activities |
| St. Louis | Part-time director & secretary, but trend toward full-time director and secy. | On retainer, volunteer service from alumnus | Presidents | 2 regular | Different places | Standing: Publicity and public relations; Fact finding; Legis.; Academic Affairs; Executive, Special: State-wide TV & Information; Retrieval & Data Processing |
| | | | | | | |
| Office of Assn. Pres. | No special director or secy. | Yes, on retainer | Presidents or others designated by institutions | 1, Annual | Different places | Executive Board--on call of President |
| Albany | Full-time Director and secretary | Special Counsel, fees for services required | Presidents. Have advisory council of Business Officers | 2 regular; others on call | Albany and NYC mostly | Exec. Committee, Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities |
| | | | | | | |
| Voluntary assistance by Exec. Dir. of Ore. College Found. and secy. for records, minutes, meeting arrangements | | None | Presidents | All on call | Different Places | None |
| Harrisburg | Half-time President, full-time secretary | No | Presidents | 1 regular; others on call | Usually Harrisburg | Exec. Committee |
| Greenville | Part-time secretary | Yes, not on retainer | College Presidents and Business Men | On call | | |
| | Voluntary officers. No full or part-time staff | No | Presidents | On call | Different places | Officers and Board serve as primary committee of the whole at present |
| | | | | | | |
| Madison | Full-time Director | None | Presidents and Deans | 2 regular; others on call | Different places | A special committee on legislation |

TABLE XIII(a)

## SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCORDING TO PRIOR
(In $1,000's)

| COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCE | SOURCE OF FUNDS | 1966/67 | 1967/68 | 1968/69 | 1969/70 | 1970/71 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. AAUP "A" salary scale (current faculty) | T | $ 195 | $ 405 | $ 632 | $ 816 | $ 1,011 | $ |
| 2. Plant rehabilitation (Calhoun and Wesley halls) | NG,GG | 53 | 200 | | | | |
| 3. Distinguished Professors: Stage I (Chemistry, economics, English, mathematics, political science) | T,GG | 25 | 79 | 145 | 154 | 163 | |
| 4. Faculty for new programs: Stage I (Classics Ph.D., Asian studies history of science, freshman honors) | T,NG,GG | 14 | 89 | 142 | 151 | 160 | |
| 5. Faculty for augmented programs: Stage I | T | 56 | 234 | 376 | 400 | 424 | |
| 6. Construction: Social Sciences building | NG,GG | 562 | 562 | | | | |
| 7. Library support: Stage I | T | 27 | 124 | 254 | 267 | 280 | |
| 8. Organized research: Stage I | NG,GG | 233 | 538 | 923 | 980 | 1,040 | |
| 9. Undergraduate student aid: Stage I | T,E<br>NG,GG | 480 | 610 | 652 | 729 | 729 | |
| 10. Graduate student aid: Stage I | T,E,<br>NG,GG | 841 | 936 | 1,109 | 1,109 | 1,237 | |
| 11. General operating costs (general expense, student services, plant operations, etc.: Stage I | T,GG | 33 | 438 | 353 | 364 | 375 | |
| 12. Distinguished Professors: Stage II | T,NG | | | | 61 | 96 | |
| 13. Faculty for new programs: Stage II (Geology Ph.D., art history Ph.D., foreign study, history of science, freshman honors) | T,NG,GG | | | | 50 | 107 | |
| 14. Faculty for augmented programs: Stage II | T | | | | 128 | 272 | |
| 15. Construction: Mathematics building | NG,GG | | 500 | | | | |

## TABLE XIII(a)

### OF OBJECTIVES ACCORDING TO PRIORITIES
(In $1,000's)

| 68/69 | 1969/70 | 1970/71 | 1971/72 | 1972/73 | 1973/74 | 1974/75 | 1975/76 | TOTAL 1967-76 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 632 | $ 816 | $ 1,011 | $ 1,217 | $ 1,436 | $ 1,668 | $ 1,914 | $ 2,174 | $11,46 |
| | | | | | | | | 253 |
| 145 | 154 | 163 | 173 | 183 | 194 | 205 | 217 | 1,538 |
| 142 | 151 | 160 | 169 | 180 | 190 | 202 | 214 | 1,511 |
| 376 | 400 | 424 | 449 | 476 | 505 | 535 | 565 | 4,029 |
| | | | | | | | | 1,124 |
| 254 | 267 | 280 | 294 | 309 | 324 | 340 | 357 | 2,576 |
| 923 | 980 | 1,040 | 1,203 | 1,269 | 1,338 | 1,411 | 1,537 | 10,472 |
| 652 | 729 | 729 | 821 | 821 | 917 | 917 | 1,018 | 7,694 |
| ,109 | 1,109 | 1,237 | 1,237 | 1,373 | 1,373 | 1,529 | 1,529 | 12,243 |
| 353 | 364 | 375 | 386 | 402 | 414 | 426 | 439 | 3,622 |
| | 61 | 96 | 173 | 183 | 194 | 205 | 217 | 1,129 |
| | 50 | 107 | 169 | 180 | 190 | 202 | 214 | 1,112 |
| | 128 | 272 | 449 | 476 | 505 | 535 | 567 | 2,932 |
| | | | | | | | | 500 |

TABLE XIII(b)

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCORDING TO PRIORITI
(In $1,000's)

| COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCE (Cont.) | SOURCE OF FUNDS | 1966/67 | 1967/68 | 1968/69 | 1969/70 | 1970/71 | 197 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. Construction: Physical Science Library | NG,GG | | $ 300 | | | | |
| 17. Construction: finish shell space for Chemistry | NG,GG | $ 216 | 216 | | | | |
| 18. Construction: finish shell space for Physics and add to building | NG,GG | 216 | 550 | $ 550 | | | |
| 19. Construction: Dyer Observatory addition | NG,GG | 50 | | | | | |
| 20. Construction: Biology building | NG,GG | | | 450 | $ 1,050 | $ 600 | |
| 21. Construction: Geology building | NG,GG | | | | | 500 | |
| 22. Library support: Stage II | T | | | | 57 | 74 | $ |
| 23. Organized research: Stage II | NG,GG | | | | 283 | 623 | |
| 24. Undergraduate student aid: Stage II | T,E, NG,GG | | | | 65 | 89 | |
| 25. Graduate student aid: Stage II | T,E, NG,GG | | | | 165 | 224 | |
| 26. General operating costs (general expense, student services, plant operations, etc.): Stage II | T,GG | | | | 313 | 484 | |
| 27. Distinguished Professors: Stage III | T,NG | | | | | | |
| 28. Faculty for new programs: Stage III | T,NG | | | | | | |
| 29. Faculty for augmented programs: Stage III | T | | | | | | |
| 30. Construction: College Library | NG,GG | | | | 2,000 | | |
| 31. Construction: Fine Arts center | NG,GG | | | | 500 | 1,000 | |
| 32. Construction: Humanities building | NG,GG | | | | | | |
| 33. Library support: Stage III | T | | | | | | |

## TABLE XIII(b)

## ARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCORDING TO PRIORITIES
(In $1,000's)

| 1968/69 | 1969/70 | 1970/71 | 1971/72 | 1972/73 | 1973/74 | 1974/75 | 1975/76 | TOTAL 1967-76 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | $ 300 |
| | | | | | | | | 432 |
| $ 550 | | | | | | | | 1,316 |
| | | | | | | | | 50 |
| 450 | $ 1,050 | $ 600 | | | | | | 2,100 |
| | | 500 | | | | | | 500 |
| | 57 | 74 | $ 75 | $ 79 | $ 83 | $ 87 | $ 92 | 547 |
| | 283 | 623 | 985 | 1,034 | 1,086 | 1,140 | 1,197 | 6,348 |
| | 65 | 89 | 164 | 180 | 210 | 210 | 240 | 1,158 |
| | 165 | 224 | 383 | 428 | 428 | 510 | 510 | 2,648 |
| | 313 | 484 | 670 | 690 | 711 | 732 | 754 | 4,354 |
| | | | | 73 | 155 | 205 | 217 | 650 |
| | | | | 100 | 210 | 336 | 358 | 1,004 |
| | | | | 221 | 468 | 764 | 810 | 2,263 |
| | 2,000 | | | | | | | 2,000 |
| | 500 | 1,000 | | | | | 600 | 2,100 |
| | | | 500 | 500 | | | | 1,000 |
| | | | | 16 | 37 | 55 | 55 | 163 |

TABLE XIII(c)

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCORDING TO PRIORIT
(In $1,000's)

| COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCE (cont.) | SOURCE OF FUNDS | 1966/67 | 1967/68 | 1968/69 | 1969/70 | 1970/71 | 1971 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. Organized research: Stage III | NG,GG | | | | | | |
| 35. Undergraduate student aid: Stage III | T,E, NG,GG | | | | | | |
| 36. Graduate student aid: Stage III | T,E, NG,GG | | | | | | |
| 37. General operating costs (general expense, student services, plant operations, etc.): Stage III | T,GG | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | $ 3,001 | $ 5,781 | $ 5,586 | $ 9,642 | $ 9,488 | $ 9, |

## TABLE XIII(c)

## SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES ACCORDING TO PRIORITIES
(In $1,000's)

| 67/68 | 1968/69 | 1969/70 | 1970/71 | 1971/72 | 1972/73 | 1973/74 | 1974/75 | 1975/76 | TOTAL 1967-76 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  | $ 60 | $ 189 | $ 492 | $ 729 | $ 1,470 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 33 | 115 | 167 | 329 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 34 | 216 | 266 | 401 | 917 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 47 | 106 | 200 | 373 |
| ,781 | $ 5,586 | $ 9,642 | $ 9,488 | $ 9,517 | $10,737 | $11,685 | $13,439 | $15,378 | $94,254 |

## TABLE XV

## ENROLLMENT, PROGRAM AND CONSTRUCTION TIMETABLE, THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

The following timetable gives approximate times at which the University proposes to introduce new programs. It also includes estimated enrollments and the construction schedule needed to permit the general expansion and the proposed specialized programs. Obviously, the timetable is approximate only and is subject to change in the light of changes in the assessment of emerging needs.

| Year | Anticipated Enrollment (FTE) | Programs To Be Introduced | Necessary Construction (dates indicate availability for use) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1962-63 | 3,500 | Junior and Senior Courses | Residence Hall (1962) Capacity 410 |
| | | International Studies | Humanities Building (1963) |
| 1963-64 | 4,800 | Program in Engineering | Residence Hall (1963) Capacity 440 |
| | | Program in News Reporting | |
| | | Program in Speech Pathology | Food Facility for Three Residence Halls (1963) |
| 1964-65 | 6,200 | Upper Division Residence Center Pinellas County | Residence Hall (1964) Capacity 600 |
| | | Program in Medical Technology | Expanded physical Education and Sports Facilities |
| | | Programs in Exceptionality and Behavioral Science | Upper Division Residence Center in Pinellas County |
| | | Graduate work to M.A. in Education and Related Liberal Arts | Physics-Astronomy Building (1964) |
| 1965-66 | 7,000 | Institute of Technology Organized and Dean Appointed | Residence Hall (1965) Capacity 600 |
| | | Graduate work to M.A. in Additional areas of Liberal Arts and Business Administration | College of Business Administration Classroom Building (1965) |
| | | Institute for International Studies | |

## TABLE XV
(continued)

| Year | Anticipated Enrollment (FTE) | Programs To Be Introduced | Necessary Construction (dates indicate availability for use) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1966-67 | 8,000 | Institute of Technology Begins Operation<br>Extension of M. A. Graduate Work | Physical Education Building<br>Residence Hall (1966) Capacity 600<br>Theatre Workshop<br>Food Service Unit<br>Institute of Technology Building<br>College of Education Classroom Building (1966)<br>Expanded University Center Facilities |
| 1967-68 | 9,000 | Program in Pathology and Microbiology<br>Extension of M.A. Graduate Work | Residence Hall (1967) Capacity 600<br>Adult Center<br>Extension of Outdoor Physical Education and Sports Facility |
| 1968-69 | 10,000 | Research Institute<br>2-year College of Medicine Organized and Dean Appointed | Residence Hall (1968) Capacity 600<br>Two Classroom-Office<br>Research Institute |
| 1969-70 | 11,000 | Extension of M.A. Graduate Work<br>College of Dentistry Organized and Dean Appointed<br>2-Year College of Medicine Begins Operation | Residence Hall (1969) Capacity 600<br>Complex for Health Related Programs<br>One Classroom Building<br>Expansion of Library Facilities<br>Auditorium to Seat 4,000 |

## TABLE XV
(continued)

| Year | Anticipated Enrollment (FTE) | Programs To Be Introduced | Necessary Construction (dates indicate availability for use) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1970-71 | 12,000 | 4-Year Dental College Begins Operation<br>Program in Public Health Administration Organized<br>First Graduate Programs to the Doctor Level in Special Fields | Residence Halls<br>Two Classroom Buildings |
| 1971-85 | If Enrollment is Limited to 12,000 to 15,000 | Expansion of Existing Programs<br>Extension of Graduate Work to Doctorate Level in Special Fields | Residence Halls (3)<br>Classroom Buildings (3)<br>Further Expansion of Student Activities Facilities |

# TABLE XVI

## PLANNING SUMMARY, THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

The role for which the University of South Florida is destined during the coming quarter century is that of rapid expansion. Only in this way can it serve its function helping to meet the needs of public higher education in the fast-growing state of Florida and the even faster growing Tampa Bay area.

Enrollment expansion will take place most rapidly during the first eight to ten years of this period. By 1970 the University's full-time-equivalent enrollment will reach an estimated 12,000, a five-fold increase over the present enrollment. Whether or not the enrollment is permitted to go well beyond this figure is a matter to be decided by state-wide policy. But unless additional public institutions of higher education are established beyond those now planned, further increase toward 20,000 or more is almost inevitable during the period 1970-85.

The scope of the University's operations must be broadened rapidly from the early concept of a limited undergraduate university to that of a large multi-purpose university operating at the graduate, as well as the undergraduate level.

Expansion of programs to these ends will be in both breadth and depth. It will represent an orderly and planned progression in keeping with the state's needs and coordinated within the state's plans for such expansion.

It is intended first to expand and build upon the programs already in existence at the undergraduate level. To do this adequately it is proposed that the University establish an upper division residence center in Pinellas County to duplicate certain undergraduate programs and offer some graduate courses for teachers.

Movement into graduate work up to the master's level will take place as soon as the full undergraduate program has been implemented. This will come first in the fields of education and related substantive areas and will be extended on a planned basis to other areas. To meet such planned expansion the library will begin building up its holdings in these areas in advance of the actual implementation of the graduate programs.

Graduate work to the doctorate level will begin about 1970 and will be confined at first to those areas most needed by the teaching profession including education, natural science and psychology. As other needs become apparent the doctoral program will be extended.

The University proposes to add only two completely new units. These are an Institute of Technology and a program of Health Related Studies. The former will provide a limited number of engineering programs as well as technical studies. The latter will include a two-year school of medicine and a four-year dental school, together with programs in nursing and other health related fields.

## TABLE XVI
(Continued)

To provide facilities for high-level research the University proposes to develop a Research Institute. To provide better for community needs it proposes to create an Adult Center to be administered jointly with the Institute for Continuing Studies.

It is not proposed at this time to duplicate other professional programs offered by the University of Florida, Florida State University or Florida A and M.

The proposals made in this report are, in the best judgment of the committee and the administration, those which will be most needed, which can be supported, and which will best serve the interests of the community, state and nation.